What follows then is that a turn should be established as a basic unit of analysis. But as already noted, a turn is likely to be composed of more than one utterance, and problems arise as to how to define a "turn."

In order for a turn to function as a representation of a speaker's communicative attempt, it should contain a unified theme for the listener to respond to If a turn consists of utterances representing different ideas, and this thematically "heterogeneous turn" is taken as the speaker's attempt, the speaker's attempt is wastefully defined, because the utterance or utterances to which the hearer would **not** respond, that is, the "inactive" utterance or utterances, are also included as part of the speaker's attempt. The following is an example of a thematically heterogeneous turn.

C:(a) I'm gonna do this (cleaning toys) later
(b) mom can I have some milk?
M: Sure you can.

The child's turn has two utterances that are thematically distinguishable. The utterance (a) is concerned with his stopping of cleaning toys, and (b) with his desire to have some milk. As the mother responds to the latter utterance, the utterance (a) becomes the inactive utterance. If the child's turn consisting of these two utterances is taken as his/her communicative attempt directed to the mother, the attempt includes the inactive, irrelevant utterance, (a), in it.

Utterance-based-turn

A solution to this dilemma is found in an "utterance-based-turn" concept. An explanation of two new terms, *facing* and *tailing* utterance, is necessary. A facing utterance is presumed to represent the way the hearer responds to the speaker's preceding attempt. When the turn includes thematically homogeneous utterances, the very first appearing utterance represents the rest as a facing utterance. A simple format of facing utterance would be:

C: I don't like cheese.

M: *Then you don't have to eat it.*

A facing utterance from a thematically homogeneous turn will be:

C: I don't like cheese.

M:(a) *You don't like cheese?*

(b) but it's good for you.

Both (a) and (b) are thematically relevant to the child's prior utterance. But by definition, (a) is taken as a facing utterance, representing the entire "active" turn.

A facing utterance from a heterogeneous turn would be:

C: I don't like cheese.

M:(a) We are going to clean up here..

(b) *did you say you don't like cheese?*

Although the mother's utterance (a) is not thematically related to the child's utterance, it is the response which **faced** the child's prior utterance, and thus entitled to be a facing utterance.

On the other hand, a "tailing utterance" is presumed to entail a message directed to the hearer, in accordance with the hearer. Normarlly, the last utterance produced in a turn is taken as a tailing utterance. While the facing utterance concept is designed to represent the way the hearer faces the prior speaker's communicative attempt, the tailing utterance concept is necessary to identify the attempted communication on the part of the speaker.

Reasons for the two conceptual distinctions are compelling. First of all, when one's turn consists of a single utterance, and if it is a responsive utterance, the utterance plays a dual function of facing **and** tailing. Consider the following example.

C: I don't like cheese.

M: *Then you don't have to eat it.*

C: I don't have to eat cauliflower with cheese then?

If one counts on its position as a response to the child's prior utterance, the mother's utterance is a facing utterance. But in a conversational sequence, the mother's response also plays a role of communicative "stimulator," eliciting the child's second turn of utterance. The distinction of the two types of utterance elevates our awareness of this dual function of a responsive utterance in "sequencing" a conversation.

The other reason is more practial. First, consider the following talk.

C: I don't like cheese.

M: (a) Then you don't have eat it.....(b) but it is good for you.

C: But I don't like it.

As previously noted, when one attempts to adopt an utterance as a basic unit of analysis, a problem arises as to whether a mother's turn such as above should be counted as two independent responses or one single responsive event. The introduction of the facing and tailing utterance concepts solves the conflict. First of all, the mother's turn can be seen in terms of its responding role. In this case, the definition of the facing utterance will come to judge which utterance to take. By definition, the first utterance (a) is taken into consideration.

Secondly, the mother's turn can be evaluated in terms of its tailing role for the child's second turn.

Presumably, when one adopts the notion of facing and tailing utterances, the basic unit of analysis is a turn-based either on the facing or on the tailing utterance. The facing-, or tailing-utterance-based turn is neither similar to the conventional concept of turn which does not take into consideration a distinction between inactive and active utterances, nor is it equated to a boundary of utterance which is not entitled to represent the entire turn of communicative thrust of the speaker. They are the responses which are entitled to represent the actual reciprocal exchanges between the

participants. The communicative thrusts made by the participants towards their partners are also assumed to be located in these facing and tauiling utterances. They are thereby established as a basic unit of analysis concerning the psychosocial dynamics between the mother and the child in a communicative context.

Definition of utterances

The utterance-based-turn unit of analysis still requires a proper definition of an utterance itself. In most previous studies, an utterance has been defined by phonetic cues or pauses. Single words, phrases, or grammatically complete or incomplete sentences have been defined as an utterance if their phonetic pauses are clear enough to announce them as a single utterance contour. This phonetic criterion, however, is not sufficient to stand as a proper criterion for defining an utterance; there is no definite measure as to how long a pause should be to be declared an utterance contour. Furthermore, the phonetic criterion tends to shatter a meaningful sentence contour into a series of stammering speech. Considering the difficulties and problems with the phonetic criterion, in the present study, a second criterion was added: When phonetic cues were not clear, semantic contour stood as the next criterion. The combination of the phonetic and semantic criteria brings about the following as the guideline for definition of an utterance:

[1] When words within a single sentence contour are stuttered with short phonetic pauses, the whole sentence contour scores as a single utterance.

[2] When introductory words or habitual responding words, like *ung, uh*, which were equal to *yeah*, are followed by a main clause, they are combined with the main clause and scored as a single utterance.

[3] Single words, particularly those repeated at the end of a sentence, are also combined with a main clause and scored as a single utterance.

[4] When single words are repeated with lengthy phonetic pauses in between, each occurrence is scored as an independent utterance.

[5] If the phonetic pauses are not decisive, the words are strung together and scored

as a single utterance.

In general, the gist of the phonetic criterion was maintained as much as possible, and at the same time, efforts are made to present the individual speech in a semantically meaningful unit.

Analysis 1: Thematic progress

Analysis 1 examined the cultural differences in the thematic progress of the mothers' facing utterances. The three thematic progress categories developed from study 1 served as the main instrument. The examination was highly explorative in character in that the focus was on the search for the cultural differences and similarities in the psychosocial dynamics underlying the thematic patterns, rather than on the determination of the cultural differences in the thematic patterns per se. The following is a description of this search process.

Cultural differences

Two raters checked the codification process of the sampled utterances from the three types of activities. The levels of agreement of scoring were as follows.

Table 9
The Levels of Scoring Agreement in Analysis 1

	Korean		Canadian	
	Woojin	Gisuk	David	Charles
T.N.R.[1]	670	1162	974	588
Agreement	99%	98%	97%	99%

[1] Total number of utterances reviewed.

The agreement levels were accepted as adequate. The application of the three thematic progress categories to the mothers' **facing** utterances produced the following results.

Table 10
Percentages of the 3 Thematic Progress Categories of Mothers' Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	*Z* score
Positive Progress	2729	68	3665	82	-14.909**
Negative Progress	671	17	602	13	5.1699**
Neutral Progress	630	16	217	5	16.975**
Total	4030		4484		

** p <.01

Significant group differences were found in all three categories. While in both groups the majority of the mothers' facing utterances resulted in positive progress (PP) the Canadian mothers produced more PP utterances, and relatively significant portions of the Korean mothers' facing utterances made negative progress (NP) and neutral progress (NuP). It was particularly notable that the most significant group difference was found in the Korean mothers' NuP facing utterances. It was implied that while the Canadian mothers' communication tended to thematically develop over the turns of exchanges, the Korean mothers' communication tended to put the thematic progress on hold.

Upon finding this, the researcher reviewed those positive progress (PP) and neutral progress (NuP) facing utterances in the original video materials in an attempt to understand the interactional impact caused by those utterances in the actual communicative context. Two observations from this review were worthy of mentioning. First, the basic difference of PP and NuP facing utterances lay in whether or not the mothers accepted what was said in the children's preceding utterance. In the PP facing utterance, the mothers basically accepted the children's utterance as a legitimate communicative assertion of independent partners. But in the NuP facing utterance, the mothers, if not totally rejecting, **hesitated** to approve of the children's preceding utterance, and appeared to check with the children in regard to what they had just said.

Secondly, while no common linguistic features were readily noticed among positive progress (PP) facing utterances, there were a few distinctive features shared by most of the neutral progress (NuP) utterances. For instance, most of the NuP utterances appeared to serve no substantial topical functions. They merely reflected what the children said. Furthermore, the communicative reflection always took an interrogative form, appearing to demand that the children confirm what they had just said. Some of these neutral progress (NuP) utterances are:

C: I don't want to eat any more.

M: *You don't?*

C: It's cute.

M: *Is it?*

C: 나 다했어

M: 다했어?

C: 이거.

M: 이거?

Through those specific features of neutral progress (NuP) utterances, the mothers seemed to check the children's own confirmation of their prior turn of communicative participation and put the children's utterance on hold. The essence of NuP utterance lay in this checking procedure. Its deterrence of the thematic progress basically had to do with an insertion of this checking procedure.

What is the nature of this checking procedure? What is it that the mothers intend to check through neutral progress (NuP) utterances? Or does the NuP utterance just appear as if it were to check? Why are the Korean mothers more liable to use this procedure? The study continued with a search for answers to these questions.

Neutral progress: The function

In order to further examine the nature of the checking procedure, it was necessary to identify the basic properties of the neutral progress (NuP) facing utterances that caused the checking procedure. An examination of the NuP facing utterances in both groups revealed that there were 4 types of neutral progress (NuP) utterances.[30] They are:

[1] Nonspecific (NS): simple confirmatory words such as *yeah? Huh?*.

[30] For details, see Appendix 4.

[2] Exact repetition (ER): Interrogatives repeating the child's utterance exactly.

[3] Partial repetition (PR): Mother's utterance that omits more than one lexical element of the child's preceding utterance.

[4] Complementary (CO): Mother's utterance that expands the child's utterance.

The percentages of the 4 types of neutral progress (NuP) utterances in both groups were as follows.

Table 11
Percentages of the 4 Types of Mothers' Neutral Progress Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Non-specific	173	28	38	20	2.186*
Partial rep.[1]	206	34	69	36	-.507
Exact rep.	156	26	66	35	-2.421*
Complementary	76	12	17	09	1.127
Total	611		190		

* $p < .05$
[1] Repetition.

An important observation emerged from this examination[31] was that the checking neutral progress, NuP, utterances were very much like the "request-for-clarification" (RC) utterances (cf. Cherry, 1979; Corsaro, 1977; Furrow & Lewis, 1987; Gallagher, 1981; Hancher, 1979; Hustler, 1981; Langford, 1981). Like RC's, the checking neutral progress, NuP, utterances were in interrogative forms which appeared to call for clarification, confirmation, or repetition of the children's prior utterance. The 4 types of checking NuP utterances were also found overlapping with the kinds of the RC's distinguished by other researchers (Corsaro, 1977). But in regard to the function of RC utterances, the other researchers emphasized the clarification process, rather than checking process. This disagreement is a point of analysis.

The above researchers have argued that the major function of request-for-clarification, RC, utterances, is to clarify a **misunderstood** utterance, or obscure intention or meanings of an utterance, and to allow the speaker to smoothly

[31] Although some group differences were observed, they were not the focus of interest and thus not discussed.

continue the communcation.

Cherry (1979), for instance, noted that,

> The request for clarification is a conventional device which functions to allow either speaker to bring a misunderstanding in the conversation to the attention of the other (p. 273).

A similar idea was expressed by Gallagher (1981).

> The unsolicited contingent query as a request for clarification serves a major discourse function. It is a means by which one party to a conversation is able to acquire information needed to respond appropriately to a conversational partner (p. 51).

This "repairment" thesis, however, did not seem to be a plausible account for the function of neutral progress, NuP, utterances. Above all, the situations where the NuP utterances were produced did not appear to be the ones in which the mothers had difficulty or trouble understanding the children's utterance. The children's utterance that was followed by the mothers' neutral progress, NuP, utterances was neither unclear in its meaning, nor produced inaudibly. The review of the video material also confirmed that the mothers' production of NuP utterances was not accompanied by their puzzling looks which might have been taken as a sign of troubled communication. An examination of the troubled sequences around the mothers' NuP utterances supported this contention (See Table 12).

Table 12
Percentages of Troubled Communication in Mothers' Neutral Progress (NuP) Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Trouble NuP	44	7	13	7	0
Total NuP	611		190		

In both groups, the percentage of the neutral progress, NuP, utterances involving a troubled communicative situation was negligibly small, implying that in contrast to the other researchers' interpretation, the NuP utterances were not produced in order to repair communicative breakdowns between the mothers and their children.

This discrepant observation between the present researcher and the other researchers prompted a need to focus on the neighboring turns of the mothers' neutral progress, NuP, utterances and to examine the impact of the NuP utterances on the

subsequent organization of the communication. The examination required a categorization of the organizational modes that resulted from a production of the mothers' NuP utterances. The following are 6 NuP organizational modes which were formulated from the present researcher's repeated examination of the relationship between NuP utterances and their neighboring utterances.[33]

[1] Redundant (Rd) mode: This is a case where an insertion of a neutral progress, NuP, utterance creates a redundant pair of turns. Consider the following example.

C: (a) I don't like this.
M: (b) *You don't like it?*
C: (c) No, I don't.
M: (d) Then you don't have to eat it.

Here the adjacent pair (b) - (c) is thematically redundant. The child's utterance (a) is audible and intelligible enough. So the mother's neutral progress, NuP, utterance (b) doesn't have any repairment to make, and the (b) - (c) pair doesn't clarify any further meaning leading the mother to the utterance (d). In fact, the mother's utterance (d) could have come out immediately after the child's utterance (a). The middle pair of turns, (b) - (c), has no role to play in leading to the mother's utterance (d). It is simply a redundant portion of the organization caused by the insertion of the NuP utterance (b). Presence of this redundant mode of organization casts doubt as to the conventional interpretation centred upon the repairment thesis.

[2] Transition (Tr) mode: In this, a neutral progress, NuP, utterance is a mere transitional filler placed before the mother's actual response to the child's preceding utterance. An example is:

[33] For details, see Appendix 5.

C: Mom, I like doing this (rocking chair).

M:(a) *You do?..*

(b) that's good.

It is important to note that the length of the pause between the mother's utterances (a) and (b) is very short, which means the mother's utterance (a) may not be intended to be a social response requesting a response of the child. It is not an utterance directed to the child. It is more likely to be a checking attempt on the part of the mother, with no real intention to hear from the child. The real thematic progress is made in the utterance (b). The utterance (a) is simply a communicative filler prior to the arrival of the relevant response. In any case, the "transition-neutral-progress" utterances are far from being a repair device for clarifying an obscure utterance.

[3] Facilitation (Fa) mode: Sometimes, the child responds to the mother's neutral progress, NuP, utterance by elaborating his prior utterance, instead of simply repeating or confirming it. In this case, the mother's NuP utterance inadvertently results in a thematic elaboration in the child's turn. An example is:

C: I went to Jim's place.

M: *You did?*

C: Yeah..and Tobi was there too.

The child, upon hearing the mother's neutral progress, NuP, utterance, is encouraged to continue with his topic introduced in the first turn. As a result, the mother's NuP utterance facilitates a thematic progress in the child's turn. More importantly, the fact that the child elaborates, instead of repeating or confirming his topic, implies that the child was confident with the clarity of his first utterance and hardly expected the mother's NuP utterance to be a request for clarification. The case seems to be that the child takes the mother's NuP utterance as a

"cheering" response to his first utterance and is reinforced to further elaborate his original idea.[33] Seemingly, the "facilitation-neutral-progress" utterance also does not support the repairment thesis.

[4] Confirmation (Cf) mode: Some of mother's neutral progress, NuP, utterances tend to end up with just eliciting the confirmation from the child, and do not make a proper follow-up. An example is:

C: I'm going to build a house.

M: *You are?*

C: (a) Yeah.

M: (no response).

Implicit in the mother's neglect of the child's confirmatory response, (a), is that the mother is not really interested in getting confirmation from the child. If the mother's neutral progress, NuP, utterance was produced with an intention to clarify any misunderstanding of the child's communcation, the child's response to this request should have been appropriately recognized and explicitly incorporated in the subsequent utterances of the mother, which will indicate that the checking procedure is, after all, purposeful. It is evident that such purposefulness is absent in "confirmation-neutral-progress" utterances.

[5] Normal (Nr) mode: If, in contrast to the confirmation mode, the child's confirmation is followed by the mother's appropriate acknowledgement, answer, repetition, further queries, or any other correspondingly relevant utterances, the involved

---

[33] Some of these facilitations are, however, rather spontaneous in character, in that they could have occurred any way even if it were not for the mother's neutral progress, NuP, utterances. But since it is practically impossible to distinguish the sequentially facilitated elaboration from an inadvertent one, in the present research, any NuP utterances that are followed by the child's thematic development, such as elaboration or extension of his prior utterance, are regarded as Facilitation.

neutral progress, NuP, utterance is said to be in a normal mode. An example is:

C: (a) This is not what I want.

M: (b) *This?* (yellow paper).

C: (c) No this (blue one).

M: (d) Oh that blue one.

The utterance (b) functions to clarify the child's utterance (a). It makes the child clarify his meaning. And upon receiving this confirmation from the child, the mother proceeds to produce (d). Without this middle pair, (b) - (c), the utterance (d) would not have come out. Thus, a "normal-neutral-progress" utterance **does** contribute to the clarification of the utterances' meaning. It is noted that normal, Nr, mode is the only mode that supports the repairment thesis of neutral progress, NuP, utterances.

[6] Aborted (Ab) mode: Any other sequences that do not fit into one of the preceding modes are noted as aborted mode. Sample utterances are:

C: Yeah it's easy..I just find them

M: *Just find them?*

C: (no response).

C: 이거는?

M: (대답 없음)

C: 이거 만들어야지 (독백)

It appears that, except for normal mode, Nr, wherein a neutral progress, NuP, utterance functions to result in thematic clarification, the rest of the organizational modes do not support the repairment thesis. More importantly, the examination of the

organizational modes of the mothers' NuP utterances in both groups demonstrated that most of the mothers' NuP utterances involved the "against-repairment-thesis" organizational modes (See Table 13).

Table 13
Percentages of the 6 Organizational Modes of Mothers' Neutral Progress Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Redundant	228	37	42	22	3.82**
Transition	139	23	49	25	-.852
Facilitation	114	19	55	29	-2.951**
Confirmation	66	11	21	11	0
Normal	37	6	13	0	3.398**
Aborted	27	4	22	12	-4.019**
Total	611		190		

Some cultural differences were observed. The Korean mothers made more redundant mode of neutral progress utterances, whereas the Canadian mothers resulted in more facilitation mode of neutral progress utterances.[34] Here, an attention was focused on the fact that in both groups, the "against-repairment-thesis" modes, that is, redundant, Rd, transition, Tr, facilication, Fa, and confirmation, Cf, modes consisted of the majority of the total organizational modes of neutral progress, NuP, utterances, and the normal, Nr, mode, which was the only "for-repairment-thesis" mode, constituted a very small percentage. It follows that the mothers' NuP utterances rarely involved any clarification organization. They appeared as if they demanded the children to clarify their utterance, but there was nothing obscure to clarify, nor was there any intention on the mothers' part to get any confirmation from the children.

At best, the neutral progress, NuP, utterances were, as initially assumed, a mere checking procedure in which the mothers reminded the children of what they said, or of their own communicative thrust that had been just directed to the mothers. Importantly, this reminding or checking procedure was undertaken without any intention of resulting in a thematic development. As seen in relation to redundant, Rd, transition, Tr, and confirmation, Cf, modes, the neutral progress, NuP, utterances led to redundant

[34] Although significant differences were also found in confirmation and normal modes, because of their negligibly small percentages, they were not further discussed.

organizations which had no thematically contributive role to play. If the function of utterances was defined by their thematic contribution to the continuation of the communication, the NuP utterances were "unnecessary" utterances in that their reminding or checking procedure was a thematically or communicatively non-contributive event.

Why then, are the Korean mothers prone to this thematically non-contributive, or unnecessary communicative procedure? Or why are the Canadian mothers more prone to the thematically progressive communication? The following discussion explores these questions.

Neutral progress: The psychosocial correlates

In discussing the nature of the mother-child communication in part II, the researcher pointed out that the mother-child communication is largely characterized by its construction process of a communicative context, and that this ongoing progress has a lot to do with the mother's disapproving attitude of the child's independent partnership. What was alluded to was that the mother's perception of the child's partnership is a key factor for her varying communicative patterns. The mother's perception issue is taken here as a point of discussion.

There are two presuppositions that an individual is required to hold in order to enter a social interaction. They are 1) the actor's **expectation** or assumption that, upon receiving the social attempt from the actor, the partner will reciprocate the actor's attempt in a special way, and 2) the actor's **ascertainment** that any social attempt made by the partner is also based on the similar expectation of a reciprocal act from the actor (Schutz, 1967). Whether or not the partner actually reciprocates the actor's expectation, or the actor himself/herself behaves according to the presupposed reciprocal expectation of the partner is not the key point. As long as there are such expectations and presumed knowledge, the participants enter the realm of intersubjectivity, and thereby a true sense of communicative interaction begins to occur.

Basically, a mother interacting with a young child has difficulty satisfying these rudimentary conditions of social interaction. The child's self is not yet fully differentiated and is not yet able to function as an independent social entity. The child's elusive self-concept is ubiquitous enough for the mother to discredit the signs of

his/her communicative competence. The mother is faced with a partner who does not seem to be able to reciprocate her communicative attempt and presuppose equal reciprocation from the mother. Theoretically, the mother ought not establish an intersubjective context with a child. But in reality the mother does have a "working" intersubjectivity with the child.

Numerous studies (e.g., Schaffer, 1977; Bullowa, 1979) have pointed out that the mother assumes an "adultmorphosized" view of the child and behaves as if the child were a fully developed competent social partner. The child's unintentional gestures or attempts are interpreted as originating with specific communicative intent, and the mother reciprocates these "communicative" gestures. When the child inadvertently exhibits a gesture in time with the mother's communicative attempt, it is regarded as a reciprocal act **toward** the mother. Such construction of intersubjectivity is possible as long as the child's "reciprocity potential" is assumed by the mother. As long as the mother can assume this potential intersubjectivity, the mother-child dyad can maintain the basic reciprocal structure of communication.

Now, suppose the opposite case where a mother cannot hold the adultmorphosized view, and is unable to satisfy the two conditions of social interaction. The mother would become "suspicious" of the child's awareness of the social nature of his/her communicative attempt. When the child initiates a communication, the child's awareness of the "in-order-to" motive behind his/her initiation will be discredited. When the child reciprocates the mother's attempt, the child's recognition of the "in-order-to" motive behind the mother's communication will be disapproved of. As a whole, the **social legitimacy** of the child's communicative attempts will be put into question.

A scrutiny of the communicative context created by neutral progress, NuP, utterances suggested that it was this social legitimacy of the child's utterance that the NuP utterances attempted to check. In other words, NuP utterances were procedures which were triggered by the mother's "hesitating" view of the child's reciprocity potential. The NuP checking procedures had an effect of improving the child's awareness of the social nature of his/her utterances. The effect is generated this way: A mother's NuP utterance mirrors the whole or part of what the child says, and projects it back to the child. Faced with his/her own utterance mirrored, the child

comes to perceive his/her own utterance from an "objective" perspective. To have his/her own utterance objectively perceived necessarily involves a perception of himself/herself as an independent interactant who can act upon and with the other and shed influence on another rather than himself/herself. The child's utterance that is reflected back to him/her sharpens the child's awareness of himself/herself as an independent partner engaged in a shared social context.

If the mother was fully convinced of the child's reciprocity potential, she would readily go into the intersubjectivity construction process, rather than undertake such a checking procedure. She would receive what the child said as a social expression of his/her motives, and not be tempted to bring to attention the social legitimacy issue of the child's communicative performance. The mother's utterances will be naturally positive thematic progress, PP, utterances. In contrast, neutral progress, NuP, utterances are indicative of the mother's challenging attitude toward the child's awareness of the social nature of his/her utterances.

Seen in this light, the cultural differences in neutral progress, NuP and positive progress, PP, utterances between the Korean and the Canadian mothers can be interpreted in terms of their cultural differences regarding to the children's psychosocial functioning in a communicative context. While both groups of mothers recognize the imbalanced parnership of their young partner, the Korean mothers seem to be more hesitant about the communicative maturity of the children. Their "hesitating" view of the children's reciprocity potential makes them more cautious in acknowledging the children's social capability of carrying on a reciprocal exchange and executing a social attempt in their own right with the expectation of a reciprocal act. The Korean children are not viewed or are less likely to be viewed as full-fledged independent interactants who can carry out those minimal but essential social responsibilities. Consequently, what the Korean children say encounters much difficulty being accepted as a definitional claim instigating the children's communicative participation.

On the other hand, having an "risking" view of the children's reciprocity potential, the Canadian mothers seem to expect the children to have a premature social awareness and relatively easily assume the social context shared by the intersubjectivity of the children. The mothers are fully ready to accept the children's utterance as the children's

contribution to the communicative participation. The Canadian mothers do not feel a need to question the communicative awareness of the social impact embedded in the child's utterances. The children are bestowed with a more or less adult level of partnership and viewed as being equally capable of communicating within the intersubjective boundary of the social world. This confidence in the children's social awareness results in a Canadian mothers' reduced production of neutral progress, NuP utterances.

Summary

An initial form of cultural differences in the mothers' communicative pattern emerged. The Korean mothers tended to insert a checking procedure in their communication and to challenge the social legitimacy of the children's prior attempt, whereas the Canadian mothers tended to readily accept the children's attempt in its own right, and incorporate it in their following turn. The differences were interpreted to be related to how the mothers viewed the children's psychosocial potential to carry a reciprocal exchange. The Korean mothers' neutral thematic progress was hypothesized as being related to their relatively **hesitating** view of the children's reciprocity potential, and the Canadian mothers' positive thematic progress to their **risking** views. The findings can be summarized as follows.

Table 14
Summary of the Results of Analysis 1

	Korean	Canadian
Thematic progress	Neutral(& negative)progress	Positive progress
Psychosocial view	Hesitating view of the child's reciprocity potential	Risking view of the child's reciprocity potential

On the other hand, there were some cultural similarities. In both groups, positive progress category had the highest rate of occurrence.

Focusing on the cultural differences in the mothers' views of the children's psychosocial potential, the researcher proceeded to analysis 2, which aimed to examine a greater variety of communicative patterns caused by the two culture-specific psychosocial views of the mothers'.

Analysis 2: Affecting styles

The objective of analysis 2 was to see how the mothers' communicative affecting styles varied along with their perceptions of the children's psychosocial reality. Affecting styles refer to the way the mothers formulate their communicative attempts directed to the children. They are revealed through both the mothers' facing and tailing utterances. First, an effort was made to determine the communicative affecting styles that corresponded to the mothers' varying assumptions of the children's reciprocity potential. The affecting style categories were to be applied to the two groups of mothers as an attempt to clarify the culture-specific psychosocial views of the mothers.

Affecting styles: The types[35]

[35] For details, see Appendix 6.

As described in analysis 1, the essence of the child's reciprocity potential consists of two elements: the mother's **expectation** and **ascertainment** of the child's social reciprocity. Let us begin by examining how the mother's affecting styles would vary when the expectation condition is or is not assumed.

Reciprocity-not-expected

That the child's reciprocity is not assumed means that the mother does not expect a reciprocated act from the child to her attempt. She presupposes that her attempt will remain unnoticed and nurture concerns about the child's reciprocity. The mother is prompted to enhance the child's awareness of the thrust of social influence from the mother. Her attention will be focused on bringing the child into the socially shared reality and making him/her realize his/her social position, which demands a reciprocity.

A communicative strategy that will facilitate such an effort on part of the mother will be a Direct Contact (DC) style, such as questioning or demanding. When the mother is employing the DC style, the child is compelled to react to the mother's inititation. When the child is questioned, regardless of whether or not he/she actually complies with this external force, he/she is burdened with an explicit responsibility. The burden is made so explicit that he cannot find a way to ignore it. Review of the video revealed that the child's ignorance of the "burden" imposed by the mother's DC style utterance instantly prompted the mother's demand for a response, which all the more attests to the presence of compulsion in the mother's prior DC style utterance.

The intimate interrelationship between the mother's direct contact, DC, style and its "reciprocity-not-expected" attitude can be more clearly demonstrated as follows. Consider the following cases of talk.

Case 1:

C: (playing with a doll).

M: (a) *Isn't it a pretty looking doll?*

C: Yeah.

Case2:

C: (playing with a doll).

M: (b) *That's a pretty looking doll.*

C: Yeah.

In both cases the semantic content of the mother's utterances is that the doll that the child is playing with is pretty. The intention of the mother's communicative attempt in (a) and (b) is identical, sharing that particular observation in the environment with the child. But the way the mother delivers this communicative attempt is different. The mother's utterance (a) is given in an interrogative form, and (b) in a declarative form. The interrogative form of utterance (a) makes it clear that the mother wants a reciprocated response from the child, whereas the utterance (b) in declarative form only implies such reciprocial motive. The interrogative form of utterance (a) serves as a cue for the child to notice that the utterance is directed to him/her and expects him/her to reciprocate. The same reciprocity expectation is also present in utterance (b), but there is no linguistic cue explicitly notifying such expectation.

A mother can employ such "non-socially-cued" utterances as (b) only when she is convinced of the child's understanding of the reciprocity rule, or at least convinced enough to risk the possibility of being-reciprocated. Without this minimum level of conviction of the child's reciprocity potential, the underlying social motive of the mother's utterances cannot dare to remain unexplicated or "uncued." In contrast, the mother's adoption of "socially-cued" utterances such as the utterance (a) implies the mother's inability to expect the child's reciprocity. The mother does not or cannot assume a reciprocated act from the child, and opts for an "insuring" attitude. The mother's social motive to be reciprocated is made known explicitly by placing the child in an incumbent situation to produce a response. The hypothesis is that such direct contact, DC, style attempts are taken by the mother to guarantee the fulfillment of the child's social responsibility to respond, and thereby to reduce the mother's communicative apprehension of not being replied.

Reciprocity-expected

In the above paragraph, it was said that when the mother assumes the child's reciprocity, she adopts a "risking" attitude. What this means is that the mother exposes her ideas without explicitly goading the child to reciprocate. Included in a risking attitude is the idiosyncratic explication of the mothers' attempt, and that Exposition (EX) of the mothers' utterances is all that is attempted; there is no effort channelled to insure the child's reciprocal attitude to the mother's attempt. Such reciprocity is already presumed to follow.

This exposition effort can be assisted by taking a declarative form. Simple declarative descriptions of the mother's observations, ideas, opinions, or experiences will comprise the exposition, EX, style utterances. But the mother's "reciprocity-expected" attitude cannot be determined only by this linguistic criterion. The essence of the attitude lies in the presence of the mother's expectation of the child's reciprocity. Declarative forms can be used without this sharing intention, such as this:

C: Mom, what time is it? (from the living room)
M: It's 9 (in the kitchen).

The above interaction contains two turns: the child's question and the mother's answer. The mother's answer suffices to complete the session of interaction. Both the mother and the child feel the answer to the question is all that is expected from the interaction. The mother's utterance is not expected to be further reciprocated by the child. Though the mother's utterance is in declarative form, it cannot be determined as an exposition, EX, style, because there is no expectation of reciprocity.

Besides the linguistic criterion, the overall sequential context is another critical criterion in identifying exposition, EX, style utterances. Consider the following.

M:(a) *You don't have enough red in your picture.*
C:(b) *Yes I do.*[36]

[36] Rising tone.

M:(c) *No..not enough red.*

C:(d) Where?

M:(e) Here (point).

C:(f) *Yes I do have.*

Here (a), (b), (c), and (f) are all exposition, EX, style utterances. Let us first consider (a). The utterance consists of the mother's comment on the child's picture. Though the utterance does not **explicitly** prompt the child to react to the comment, the contextual cue and the prosodic information signify that the mother desires to hear from the child in regard to her comment that there is not enough red in the picture. The child clearly recognizes this hidden communicative call for a response and responds with (b). Interestingly, the child's utterance (b) has the same kind of communicative demand placed on the part of the mother, to react to the child's observation that he had enough red. This communicative demand is created by the prior context where the mother requests the child to express his idea about the mother's comment and hints that his response will be further considered by the mother. The utterance (f) has the same kind of reciprocity expectation of the mother's response. This expectation is generated from the entire context where the child's utterance (f) opposes the mother's prior utterance (e), and the child would like to hear about what the mother thinks about his opposition.

Owing to its context-bound nature, the exposition, EX, style utterance can be easily identified by eliminating the other speaker's turn following the EX style utterance. If the elimination results in a communicative "vacuum," the mother's utterance was likely to be an EX style utterance. For instance, in the above talk, if the child does not respond by (b) to the mother's utterance (a), the mother's utterance (a) would appear to have been ignored by the child. This impression is caused by the presence of the implicit demand in (a) for a response, and this communicative vacuum is the evidence for the utterance (a)'s EX status.

On the other hand, if the absence of the response from the hearer does not create this communicative impression, it is because the utterance does not originally expect to be shared by the hearer. For instance, suppose the child's utterance (f) is

followed by the mother's comment (g), *Oh?...O.K.*,[37] which is the mother's concurrence to the child's argument. Even if the child does not further respond to this (g), the mother's utterance does not appear to have been ignored. It is because the mother's utterance (g) does not entail further intention to negotiate with the child, and this message that the exchange of talk is terminated and that it is "o.k." even if she is not further responded to is prosodially signalled to the child.

In sum, the essence of exposition, EX, style utterances lies in the mother's exposition of her own opinions or ideas with a covertly implied expectation of it being shared with the child.

Reciprocity-ascertained[38]

When the mother is assured of the child's awareness of the social impact of his/her utterance, that is, the elicitation of his/her utterance of a reciprocated act from the mother, she would take what the child says as a socially legitimate attempt and fill in her turn by appropriately responding. With no effort spared for the checking procedure challenging the social basis of the child's attempt, the mother will focus on her part of participation. This reciprocating act may take a form of exposition, EX, style, and further continue the communication by expecting the child's reciprocal turn.

Another way to perform the reciprocating act is to acknowledge just the instance of the child's social attempt, but to make no more effort to continue the communication. In this latter Acknowledging (AC) style, the social legitimacy of the child's preceding attempt is basically accepted, but its acceptance is minimally represented, acknowledging only the occurrence of such an attempt. The child knows that the mother has registered his/her attempt, that is, that he/she has managed to get his/her attempt noticed by the mother, but since there is no new idea added by the mother, the child remains without knowledge as to what the mother specifically thinks of his/her attempt. If the child's prior utterance was intended to share the idea with the

---

[37] Falling tone.

[38] The idea of "Reciprocity-not-ascertained" was already discussed through the notion of checking procedure of neutral progress, NuP, utterances, thus not included in analysis 2.

mother, the AC style utterance would bring an end to this initiation and create a momentary topical vacuum. Consider the following:

C:(a) What is this?

M:(b) A dog.[39]

The mother's answer completes the question session, and inadvertently brings about an interactional completion. Since the prosodic information signals that she is no longer interested in the particular session of interaction, in order for the interaction to be continued, either of the parties should undertake a new communicative initiative. If the child's turn was tailed by the mother's utterance in a specific way, all that he/she has to do to continue the interaction is to appropriately respond to the mother's communicative scaffolding. Since an acknowledging, AC, style utterance does not encourage the child's further response, the child has to initiate a communication on his/her own to continue the interaction. Thus, although an AC style utterance is a minimal sign that the child's reciprocity is not completely denied, it does not give further impetus to the continuation of the communication.

In addition to the direct contact, DC, exposition, EX, acknowledging, AC, styles, there can be a case of No Response (NR). It is a case where the mother does not produce any utterance or response at all. Since a NR style utterance does not have its own concrete property, its function can only be determined in its context. If the child's prior utterance is of DC style, the mother's NR style utterance signifies the mother's communicative neglect. If the child's preceding utterance is of EX style, the mother's NR style utterance can be indicative of the mother's insensitivity to the child's implicit invitation to a shared social world. If the child's prior utterances are of the AC or NR style, and the child shows no more interest in reciprocity, the mother's NR style utterances do not produce any negative impact on the progression of the communication.

---

[39] With falling tone signifying the end of her turn.

In sum, there are 3 more communicative styles, direct contact, DC, exposition, EX, and acknowledging, AC, which would represent different perceptions of the child's psychosocial reality, and no response, NR, of which psychosocial correlates are not identifiable at this point. These communicative patterns were applied to the mothers' communicative data of each group. These results are discussed next.

Affecting styles: The cultural differences

The researcher codified the data, and the samples of codification were submitted to a reliability check. The levels of agreement are follows:

Table 15
The Levels of the Scoring Agreement in Analysis 2

	Korean		Canadian	
	Woojin	Gisuk	David	Charles
T.N.R.[1]	670	1162	974	588
Agreement	98%	96%	97%	98%

[1] Total number of utterances reviewed.

The 4 affecting styles were applied to examine the mothers' affecting styles in facing the children's utterances. The initial result is as follows.

Table 16
Percentages of the 4 Facing Affecting Styles of Mothers' Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct contact	2182	54	1669	37	15.736**
Exposition	700	17	1444	32	-15.921**
Acknowledging	1035	26	1078	24	2.133*
No response	113	3	293	7	-8.648**
Total	4030		4484		

Attention was paid to the significant cultural differences in direct contact (DC) and exposition (EX) styles.[40] In both groups, DC was the most frequently observed style

[40] Though the no response, NR, style, too, showed a significant difference, since its proprotions were rather negligibly small in both groups, they were not taken into further consideration. Similarly, the difference in acknowledging style

of the mothers' facing utterances. Regardless of the cultural backgrounds, the mothers responded to or faced the children's preceding utterance by questioning or commanding. Considering that DC style utterances reflected the mothers' reciprocity-not-expected attitude, the high production of direct contact (DC) style utterances in both groups suggests the general apprehension tendency of the mothers in regard to the children's reciprocity. The Korean mothers' higher proportion of DC style utterances indicates their more entrenched orientation to this attitude. In contrast, the cultural difference in exposition (EX) style utterances signifies the Canadian mothers' stronger tendency toward the reciprocity-expected attitude. Though the Canadian mothers were also more prone to DC than to EX style, when compared with the Korean mothers, they had a stronger orientation to the reciprocity-expected attitude.

The Korean mothers' reciprocity-not-expected attitude and the Canadian mothers' reciprocity-expected attitude are, however, yet to be determined. The data in Table 16 represent how the mothers **faced** the children's utterance, but do not show how the mother's tailing efforts were made. When the mothers' turns included more than one utterance, the tailing utterance could be in a different style. So, even if the Korean mothers tended to face the children's utterance with a direct contact (DC) style, there is a possibility of ending their turn with styles other than DC. Likewise, although the Canadian mothers favored the exposition (EX) style, they might tail the children's turn with different styles. An examination of the mothers' tailing utterances of the turns starting with a DC or EX style, however, revealed that such possibilities were unlikely (see Table 17).

Table 17
Percentages of the 4 Tailing Affecting Styles of Mothers' Direct-Contact-Faced Turns

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct contact	2071	95	1534	92	3.773**
Exposition	88	4	121	7	-4.072**
Acknowledging	20	1	11	1	0
No response	3	0	3	0	0
Total	2182		1669		

[40](cont'd) was also overlooked. Instead, attention was paid to the more profound differences observed in direct contact, DC, and exposition, EX, styles. This partial consideration of results was intended to focus on and highlight the most prominent cultural differences.

In both groups, the mothers' turns starting with a direct contact (DC) style were most likely to end up with a DC style. Being consistent with the finindgs in Table 16, the Korean mothers exceeded the Canadian mothers in DC style tailing of DC-faced turns, whereas the Canadian mothers surpassed the Korean mothers in EX style tailing of DC-faced turns.

The style consistency in facing and tailing attempts was also observed in exposition (EX) style utterances (see Table 18).

Table 18
Percentages of the 4 Tailing Affecting Styles of Mothers' Exposition-Faced Turns

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct Contact	122	18	379	26	-4.105**
Exposition	575	82	1058	74	4.077**
Acknowledging	2	0	4	0	0
No Response	1	0	3	0	0
Total	700		1444		

Interestingly, the Korean mothers had a higher percentage of exposition (EX) tailing styles for the EX-faced turns, whereas the Canadian mothers exceeded the Korean mothers in tailing the EX-faced turns with direct contact (DC) style.

Attention was paid to the fact that in both groups, the majority of the mothers' EX facing turns had EX tailing utterances. Combining the results in Tables 16, 17, and 18, it can be suggested that not only in facing the children's prior utterance, but also in tailing the children's following utterances, the Korean mothers' affecting style is characterized by the DC style, and the Canadian mothers' by the EX style. But a conclusion that the Korean mothers are oriented to the reciprocity-not-expected and the Canadian mothers to the reciprocity-expected attitude is inconclusive. The above results indicate the affecting styles only, and do not reveal whether the utterances in each style are thematically relevant ones or not. Although the Korean mothers used more DC style utterances, it is unknown whether those DC style utterances were thematically relevant. Similarly, it is unknown whether or not the Canadian mothers' EX style utterances were

thematically progressive ones.

The information on the thematic relevance of the utterances is particularly important for interpreting the exposition (EX) style utterances. In the case of direct contact (DC) style utterances, regardless of whether the utterances are thematically relevant or not, the interrogative form itself reflects the mothers' attempt to directly affect the children. But the argument that EX style utterances represent the reciprocity-expected, or reciprocity-ascertained attitude presupposes that the EX style utterances are thematically relevant. If the Canadian mothers' EX style utterances are not thematically relevant, their orientation to the reciprocity-expected or reciprocity-ascertained attitude is not tenable.

Thus, a further effort was made to examine the thematic progress of the utterances categorized in the 4 affecting styles. The results are:

Table 19
Thematic Progresses of Mothers' 4 Affecting Style Utterances

		Korean		Canadian		
		f	%	f	%	Z score
DC	Positive Progress	1116	51	1271	76	-15.84**
	Negative Progress	449	21	205	12	7.37**
	Neutral Progress	617	28	193	12	12.07**
	Total	2182		1669		
EX	Positive Progress	589	84	1244	86	.321
	Negative Progress	108	15	190	13	1.2553
	Neutal Progress	3	0	10	1	0
	Total	700		1444		
AC	Positive Progress	991	96	1057	98	-1.118
	Negative Progress	34	3	9	1	4.3851**
	Neutral Progress	10	1	12	1	0
	Total	1035		1968		
NR	Positive Progress	33	29	93	32	-.5855
	Negative Progress	80	71	198	68	.5831
	Neutral Progress	0	0	2	2	1.899

Total	113	293

Three observations can be confidently made. First, the Korean mothers' direct contact, DC, style utterances were less likely to be thematically progressive than the Canadian mothers' DC style utterances. Large proportions of the Korean mothers' DC style utterances were either negative progress, NP, or neutral progress, NuP, utterances, whereas the majority of the Canadian mothers' DC style utterances were thematically progressive. Given that DC style utterances are related to the mother's insuring attitude, one can say that in taking an insuring attitude, the Korean mothers tended to disregard what the children's prior utterance or state was, whereas the Canadian mothers managed to incorporate the children's prior condition.

Secondly, in both groups, the rate of positive progress, PP, utterances, increased in exposition, EX, and acknowledging, AC, styles. There was no group difference in this correlation. What is implied is that regardless of the cultural backgrounds, the mothers' EX or AC style makes thematically progressive utterances more likely than direct contact, DC, style, the attention to the thematic progress decreasing as they switch to the DC style. The Korean mothers are more prone to this non-progressive tendency of the DC style.

Thirdly, combined with the previous result implying the Canadian mothers' orientation to the exposition, EX, style, their high percentage of positive progress EX style utterances allows us to argue for the Canadian mothers' reciprocity-ascertained, or reciprocity-expected attitude.

What becomes evident through the result of Tables 16, 17, 18 and 19 is that the Korean mothers have a stronger tendency toward a direct contact, DC, style and the Canadian mothers are more oriented to an exposition, EX, style. Such culture-specific communicative styles correspond to the Korean mothers' reciprocity-not-expected attitude, and the Canadian mothers' reciprocity-expected, or reciprocity-ascertained attitude.

But the analysis is still incomplete. All that has been observed and examined thus far is the mothers' general tendency in choosing the affecting styles and the styles' thematic progressiveness. What has not been illustrated is the reciprocal patterns of the

affecting styles between the mothers and the children.

Such information is critical in evaluating the above findings. If the Korean mothers' direct contact, DC, style utterances are produced after the children finish their turn with an acknowledging, AC, style utterance, which usually brings about a momentary topical vaccuum, the DC style utterances, even if they are not thematically progressive, can be favorably evaluated for their initiating intent. But if the Korean mothers resort to a DC style when the children try with an exposition, EX, style, the children's intent to carry a reciprocity-ascertained or reciprocity-expected mature dialogic pattern of communication ends up with the mothers' DC attempt. Thus, the true understanding of the nature of the Korean mothers' DC and the Canadian mothers' EX styles requires an examination of the correlational aspect of the mothers' and the children's affecting styles.

First, the mothers' facing styles were examined in relation to the specific style of the children's preceding utterance. The affecting styles of the mothers' utterances when the children's prior utterance was in direct contact, DC, style are as follows.

Table 20
Percentages of the 4 Affecting Styles of Mothers' Utterances When the Children's Prior Utterance is Direct Contact Style

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct Contact	319	37	280	27	4.669**
Exposition	131	15	279	27	-6.328**
Acknowledging	374	44	398	38	2.65**
No Response	31	3	89	8	-4.46**
Total	855		1046		

In both groups, the mothers' most predominant style to the children's direct contact, DC, style tailing utterance was acknowledging, AC. When the mothers were asked, requested, or ordered to do something by the children, they tended to take an "economical" attitude and provide only what was being asked or requested, with no further effort to elaborate the topic.[41] The Korean mothers were more prone to this

[41] Presence of this economical attitude of the mothers puts forth an anti-thesis to the common belief that the mother-child communication is largely characterized by the mother's elaborative, or dialogue-like communicative effort.

economical attitude.

On the other hand, significant group differences were observed in direct contact, DC, and exposition, EX, styles. The Korean mothers exceeded the Canadian mothers in their DC style facing utterances, whereas the Canadian mothers exceeded the Korean mothers in their EX style utterances. What is implied is that the Korean mothers were more likely to turn the children's DC attempt back to the children and place them in an answering position, whereas the Canadian mothers faced the children's DC attempt with a dialogic pattern of communication.

The Korean mothers' "direct-contact-based-hesitant" attitude, and the Canadian mothers' "exposition-based-assured" attitude toward the children's reciprocity are again confirmed in the following result.

Table 21
Percentages of the 4 Affecting Styles of Mothers' Utterances When the Children's Prior Utterance is Exposition

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct Contact	612	55	481	33	11.194**
Exposition	158	14	525	36	-12.538**
Acknowledging	295	27	321	21	3.539**
No Response	43	4	145	10	-5.804**
Total	1108		1472		

Even when the children finished with an exposition, EX, style utterance and showed an intent to carry an assured dialogic pattern of communication, the Korean mothers continued to resort to the direct contact, DC, style, and did not correspond with an EX style utterances. If not responding with DC, the Korean mothers resorted to acknowledging, AC, style. On the other hand, the Canadian mothers' significantly higher percentage of EX style utterance indicates their higher possibility of EX-based dialogic style to the children's EX attempt. It is also noted that the Canadian mothers were more prone to no response, NR, style, an observation for which interpretation cannot be made immediately.

The Korean mothers' tendency towards direct, DC, style had another interesting effect: DC style made the Korean mothers appear more enthusiastic in initiating a new

thematic turn and removing the topical vacuum resulted from the children's acknowdging, AC, tailing utterances (see Table 22).

Table 22
Percentages of the 4 Affecting Styles of Mothers' Utterances When the Children's Prior Utterance is Acknowledging

	Korean		Candian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct Contact	765	53	581	43	5.277**
Exposition	343	24	423	31	-4.134**
Acknowledging	301	21	295	22	-.643
No Response	30	2	47	4	-3.217**
Total	1439		1346		

When the children's preceding utterance is acknowledging, AC, style, this means that the mothers are left with a burden of initiating another topic to continue the interaction. The Korean mothers' higher production of direct contact, DC, style utterances indicates their highly motivated attitude to initiate an interaction. Even in this type of situation, the Canadian mothers were more likely to adopt an exposition, EX, style to initiate the momentarily discontinued communication. The Canadian mothers' higher percentage of no response, NR, is also observed, although it was only a very small percentage.

The Korean mothers' dependence on direct contact, DC, and the Canadian mothers' dependence on exposition, EX, style in re-initiating a communication are also evident in the following table.

Table 23
Percentages of the 4 Affecting Styles of Mothers' Utterances When the Children's Prior Utterance is No Response

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct Contact	486	77	327	53	8.896**
Exposition	68	11	217	35	-10.099**
Acknowledging	65	10	64	10	0
No Response	9	2	12	2	0
Total	628		620		

Even when the children's prior turn was marked with no utterance, the Korean mothers still relied on direct contact, DC, style, and the Canadian mothers on exposition, EX, style, to prompt the children for active participation.

The cultural differences in EX style utterances were also observed in the proportions of the mothers' EX utterances in the 4 styles of the children's preceding utterances (see Table 24).

Table 24
Percentages of Mothers' Exposition Facing Utterances Across Children's 4 Tailing Styles

	Korean		Canadian		
Ch's style	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct Contact	131	19	279	19	0
Exposition	158	23	525	37	-6.524**
Acknowledging	343	49	423	29	9.062**
No Response	68	9	217	15	-3.837**
Total	700		1444		

The Korean mothers produced most of their exposition, EX, style utterances when the children's prior turn finished in an acknowledging, AC, style. The Korean children's EX style utterances had a significantly smaller chance to be faced or responded to by the mothers' EX style utterances. In contrast, the Canadian mothers' EX style utterances were mostly produced when the children's prior utterances were EX style utterances, implying the presence of a "colleagial" pattern of communication in the Canadian dyads.[42] The interpretation on the Canadian mothers' higher percentage of exposition, EX, after the children's no reponse, NR, style, cannot be made immediately.

On the other hand, there were no significant differences in the proportions of the mothers' direct contact, DC, acknowledging, AC, and no response, NR, styles across the child's preceding utterances of 4 styles, which suggests that the functions of those styles were more or less the same in both cultural groups. For example, in both groups, the majority of DC utterances were produced to initiate a new interaction when the ongoing interaction was brought to an end by the children's AC tailing utterances (see Table 25).

[42] A further description of the colleagial patterns of communication follows.

Table 25
Percentages of Mothers' Direct Contact Facing Utterances Across Children's 4 Styles of Preceding Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
Ch's style[1]	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct Contact	319	15	280	17	-1.697
Exposition	612	28	481	29	-.682
Acknowledging	765	35	581	35	0
No Response	486	22	327	19	2.261*
Total	2182		1669		

[1] Children's tailing styles

It seems that the main function of direct contact, DC, in both groups, was to bridge the momentary topical gap and to bring the children back to the interactional context. The Korean mothers' higher percentage of DC in the children's no response, NR, style suggests that the Korean mothers made more use of the DC's initiating function. The same interpretation of communicative universality is applied to the function of acknowledging, AC, style utterances.

Table 26
Percentages of Mothers' Acknowledging Facing Utterances Across Children's 4 Styles of Preceding Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
Ch's styles	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct Contact	374	36	398	37	-.477
Exposition	295	29	321	30	-.506
Acknowledging	301	29	295	27	1.021
No Response	65	6	64	6	0
Total	1035		1078		

The majority of the mothers' acknowledging, AC, utterances were produced when the children's prior utterance was of the direct contact, DC, style. It may be that AC utterances are more often used to simply answer the children's question, or satisfy the children's demand at hand.

Another universal feature of the mothers' communication is found in the no response, NR, style (see Table 27).

Table 27
Percentages of Mothers' No Response Style Utterances Across Children's 4 Styles of

Preceding Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
Ch's style	f	%	f	%	Z score
Direct Contact	31	27	89	30	-.594
Exposition	43	38	145	50	-2.173*
Acknowledging	30	27	47	16	2.534*
No Response	9	8	12	4	1.631
Total	113		293		

In both groups, the largest production of mothers' no response, NR, was observed when the children's prior utterance was of the exposition, EX, style. It means that when the children adopt the non-cued social attempt, the children's implicit demand for reciprocity is less likely to be fulfilled. The mothers' hesitating view of the children's expectation of social reciprocity seems to be the reason. The important point is that such a generally unsure attitude towards the children's psychosocial ability is present in both the Korean and the Canadian groups.

Two other observations to note are: 1) Although the Canadian mothers tended to respond with EX style to the child's EX tailing utterance (cf., Table 21), they showed a higher percentage of NR to the child's EX style utterance; 2) The Korean mothers used more NR when the children's prior utterance was acknowledging, AC, style.

By and large, culture-specific communicative patterns of the mothers emerged. The Korean mothers are largely characterized by their enthusiastic effort to insure the children's reciprocity; the Canadian mothers easily assume that the child will reciprocate. The different psychosocial attitudes result in different patterns of communication. The Korean mothers' effort results in the "Leader-Follower" type of communicative pattern wherein the mothers most of the time play the role of leader or initiator, and the children of the follower, the responder. The Canadian mothers' assumption of an equal partnership of the children enables them to regard the children as independent partners and to carry a "Colleagial" type of communication.

On the other hand, regardless of the cultural backgrounds, the mothers have some degree of communicative apprehension for the children's communicative performance, particularly for their observing of the reciprocity principle. Also, unlike the popular belief that the mother-child communication is characterized by its dialogic

continuation, the general response of the mothers to the children's communicative initiation in both cultures was executed on the basis of an "economy of communication" principle.

Let us now look at the more specific psychosocial dynamic patterns underlying the Leader-Follower and the Colleagial patterns of communication.

Affecting styles: The psychosocial dynamics

The significance of analysis 2 lies in its illustration of the universal as well as culture-specific features of the mother-child communication. Amidst many others, it has been clearly shown that regardless of the mothers' cultural backgrounds, the mothers basically have apprehension for the children's ability to carry on a reciprocal communication. As argued in Part II, the whole communicative attempts of the mothers are geared to manage the inherently imbalanced partnership. The cultural differences are found in this management style, but not in the presence or the absence of such an imbalanced partnership.

The Korean mothers' "Direct contact-centred-Leader-Follower" pattern versus the Canadian mothers' "Exposition-centred-Colleague" pattern should be discussed within this management framework. The determining factor for a selection of a particular management strategy is, as seen in analysis 1, the degree to which the mothers recognize the children's reciprocity potential. If the mothers have a relatively hesitating view, they are likely to opt for the insuring management which increases the children's awareness of the social context by explicitly giving a task to the children to reciprocate. If the mothers are convinced of the children's psychosocial ability to reciprocate, they call for the children's spontaneous reciprocity.

An interesting phenomenon is that while the latter management results in a more or less "equalized partnership", the former directed management tends to lead to a "specialized partnership." Let us look at the following talk to understand these considerations.

C:(a) This does not move.

M:(b) It is because of the old playdoh stuck in there.

C:(c) I didn't do it.

M:(d) I know you didn't do it purposely, but you did not clean it properly after use.

The talk is equalized in that both the mother and the child participate as a communicative "colleague," with spontaneous reciprocity. Neither the mother nor the child explicitly solicits a reciprocal response from the other. They are both ensured of their partner's reciprocal response, and fulfill their turn by sharing their idea. There is no leader demanding a response, nor follower being pressed to respond.

Suppose the same talk is organized as follows.

C:(a') This does not move.

M:(b') That does not move?

C:(c') Yeah.

M:(d') You know why?

C:(e') Why?

M:(f') Because you did not clean it properly.

If one looks at the communicative role played by the child, he/she notices that it mainly consists in the "filling-in's" of "holes" made by the mother. The child's participation is not spontaneous; it is framed by the mother and it is the main role of the mother to frame and induce the child's participation. In this case, the participatory roles of the mother and the child are specialized. It is the mother who frames the communication, and the child's contribution is to fill in the given frame.

What type of partnership management will be chosen by the mothers is a function of their views of the children's psychosocial potential. But during the course of actual communicative management, a specific dynamic pattern of the psychosocial reality between the mother and the child comes to take place, and the actual management processes are largely governed by these psychosocial dynamics. Let us first examine these dynamics of the specialized partnership management.

In the specialized partnership management, the mother provides the communicative frame. The mother provides a specific task for the child to accomplish. The mother has difficulty leaving the child's psychosocial reality as being independent. The child is viewed as having to be specifically guided and stimulated. As the mother does not acknowledge the autonomous functioning of the child's reality, she "inserts" herself to replace the child for the operation of the child's reality. A result is the mother's communicative participation attuned to the child's incompetent status. The child's participation is largely framed or defined by the mother's "in-charge" status. In other words, the mother comes to be psychosocially present in the child's reality and creates a "relationally attuned" psychosocial dynamic.

In contrast, in the equalized partnership management, the realities of the mother and the child are "individually-attuned." The mother allows the child to be psychosocially differentiated. It is assumed that the child is able to function on his/her own and to observe the reciprocity principle. This differentiation is achieved by placing the mother herself in a differentiated position. For example, she presents her ideas in declarative form, and makes no direct attempt to affect the child. Metaphorically speaking, the mother, as a separate reality from the child, puts forth her communicative attempt in the "shared" common reality, and expects the child to come out of his/her "territory" and register the message. There is no intrusion of the mother's reality into the child's, as in the case of relationally-attuned dynamic. The mother and the child remain in their own individuated reality, and their communicative attunement to one another occurs in the social context constructed on the basis of their assumption of the other partner's reciprocity.

Such concepts of culture-specific psychosocial dynamics are important. They provide a plausible and precise account of the Korean mothers' overall lower percentage of positive progress, PP, utterances (cf. Table 19). Through the relationally-attuned dynamic, the Korean mothers lend themselves for the children's psychosocial functioning. The mothers function for the children. The mothers take the in-charge status. Naturally, the attempts are likely to be taken from the mothers' perspective. The mothers' utterances may semantically concern the children's reality, but they are interpreted from the mothers' perspective. This prevalence of the mothers' perspective

is not likely to result in positive progress, PP, utterances, which require an attention to the children's reality.

It is, however, imperative to make it clear that the lack of positive progress, PP, utterances in the Korean mothers is not taken as a sign of their authoritarian perspective. In other words, that the Korean mother-child communication is carried primarily by the mothers' perspective is not to suggest that the Korean mothers **intend** to disregard or ignore the children's perspective. After all, the Korean mothers' specialized communicative pattern originates as an attempt to manage the imbalanced partnership inherent in their communication with the young partners. It is a communicative measure to assist, but not to ignore, the incompetent children, and together construct a socially shared context. The elevation of the Korean mothers' perspective to the in-charge status is a result of their effort to establish such a collaborative communicative context with the young partners.

Summary

The culture-specific psychosocial views and the thematic progressions emerged from analysis 1 were further specified and elaborated.

First, the concepts of psychosocial views were articulated with the concept of psychosocial **attitudes** and psychosocial **dynamics**. The Korean mothers' hesitating view of the children's reciprocity potential was found to lead to the hesitant psychosocial attitude, and eventually result in relationally-attuned psychosocial dynamics between the mothers and the children. The Canadian mothers' risking view was based on assured psychosocial attitude and formulated an individuatedly-attuned psychosocial dynamic.

Secondly, the "neutral progress nature" of the Korean mothers' communication and the "positive progress nature" of the Canadian mothers' communication were articulated with related communicative styles and the partnerships. The Korean mothers adopted more direct contact, DC, style utterances, whereas the Canadian mothers were more prone to exposition, EX, style utterances. The former mothers' DC affecting style, in turn, created a Leader-Follower communicative pattern, and resulted in a specialized partnership. The Canadian mothers' EX style enabled them to lead a Colleagial pattern that is maintained by an equalized partnership. The result is summarized in Table 28.

Table 28
Summary of the Results of Analysis 2

	Korean	Canadian
Affecting styles	Direct Contact	Expostion
Communicative patterns	Leader-Follower	Colleague
Partnership	Specialized	Equalized
Psychosocial attitude	Hesitant	Assured
Psychosocial dynamics	Relationally attuned	Individually attuned

Analysis 3 intended to confirm these culture-specific communicative partnerships and psychosocial dynamics with more comparative data.

Analysis 3: Semantic contents

Semantic content: Its importance

During the scoring of direct contact, DC, style utterances in analysis 2, two interesting observations were made. One was that not only were the two groups of mothers different in the sheer number of DC style utterances produced, they also showed differences in the specific content of the DC style utterances. It appeared that more of the Korean mothers' DC style utterances were concerned with the children. A group difference was also seen in regard to the mothers' concerns about themselves: The Canadian mothers seemed to produce more of the mother-related utterances.

Furthermore, the Korean mothers' direct contact, DC, style questions did not seem to have been produced to obtain information from the children. It appeared that the mothers were not really interested in getting the children's response. Normally, one poses a question to obtain a piece of information he/she has no idea of, as in the following examples.

A: (a) What time is it?

B: Ten after two.

A produces the sentence (a) to **ask** B for the information, the time, of which A has no idea. The purpose of the question (a) is to get that information from B.

The questions raised by the Korean mothers, however, appeared to serve other purposes than obtaining an absent knowledge. An example is:

C: (folding paper).

M:(b) Are you folding the paper?

The mother already knows the answer to her question (b). Her question merely **reads** off the child's behavior and describes to the child what he is doing, requesting him to confirm the mother's observation. While a question like (a) is **informative** in nature, (b) is characterized by its **affective** tone. An affective question speaks for the child by describing what the child does or says in prescriptive manners.

In fact, the modes in which the contents are expressed are no less important in investigating the psychosocial topography. Consider the following talk.

Case 1:

C: (nearing the video equipment)

M: (a) Please come here...don't touch that.

Case 2:

C: (nearing the video equipemnt).

M: (b) You're not going to touch it, are you?

The mother's utterances (a) and (b) are concerned with the child's behavior, and the intentions behind them are more or less the same: inhibiting the child's approaching

the equipment. But (a) and (b) imply different psychosocial dynamics between the mother and the child. First of all, it is noted that (a) is presented in a controlling mode. The mother impinges upon the child's psychosocial right to put his own reality under his control. The mother's psychosocial reality takes over the child's world and exercises influence for the operation of the child's reality. In (b), on the other hand, the mother reminds the child of what he is doing, and hints to the child to take measures in his own right. So in case 2, the child's psychosocial reality remains approved of for its own functioning. If it were not for the interest in the impacts of the presentational mode, such subtle differences between the (a) and (b) in respect to the hidden psychosocial dynamics would be likely to go unnoticed.

Upon these observations, it was decided to further examine the semantic aspects as well as the presentational modes of the mother's utterances. The first task to be done was a determination of semantic categories and presentational modes.

Semantic contents: Categories and presentational modes

First of all, efforts were made to develop the semantic content categories representing particular areas of the world that the mothers were concerned with. A review of the corpus of data showed that the semantic contents of the mother's communication could be categorized roughly into 4 areas: the child, the mother, the child and the mother, and the outside world.

[1] Child (CHI) area: CHI covers any kind of topics that are related to the child. Any thing about the child, or any attempt to shed some influence on the child belong to this category. CHI utterances cover physical, psychological, behavioral, and social aspects of the child's world.[43] Examples would be:

C: (folding paper).

M: *What are you going to do with it?*

[43] The other semantic content areas also have these four aspects as sub-domains. For detailed definition, see Appendix 7.

M: *Are you hungry?*

M: 밥이 컸구나.

Some utterances may involve the child's reality, but not necessarily focus on the child, as below.

C: (cutting paper with a pair of scissors).
M: (a) It may cut your finger ...(b) *be careful*.

The utterance (b) is a child-related, CHI, utterance, but not (a). In a broad sense, (a) is also related to the child. It is about the physical harm that can be caused to the child by the use of scissors. But the utterance itself is **about** the possible danger of the misuse of scissors, and the concern with the child's welfare is only **implied**. By definition, an utterance has to be directly and explicitly concerned with the child's reality to be scored as CHI.

The reason for opting for the rather narrowly defined concept of child category, CHI, is that virtually every utterance the mother produces during the interaction with the child is related to the child in one way or another in that it is directed to the child. If it were not for the directness-based definition, those "spoken-to-the-child" utterances would also have to be included in CHI.

[2] Mother (MOT) area: Mother-related area is the same as child-related, CHI, except that it is concerned with the mother. MOT represents the mother's idea, behavior, plan, experience, or anything related to her psychosocial reality. Examples are:

C: Where did you learn that?
M: *I think I learn that at school*.

C: Why milk?

M: *I don't know about you.... but whenever I have something sweet, I feel like having some milk.*

C: 엄마는?

M: 엄마는 나중에 갈께

[3] Child and Mother (CAM) area: It refers to utterances about both the mother and the child. The existence of the experiences or situations common to both of the dyad are the key factors.

C: This is a duck.

M: *Yeah we saw ducks in the lake, didn't we?*

M: 엄마랑 같이 만들었잖아.

M: 우리 그때 같이 산에 갔었지.

[4] World (WOR) area: WOR includes the information about the social or physical environment. Examples are:

C: (trying to get things out).

M: *It won't work; it's stuck.*

C: 왜?

M: 겨울에는 추우니까.

M: 그거는 빨간 색이야.

In addition to the 4 semantic content categories, 4 presentational modes were also determined.[44] One of the major criteria in formulating the presentational modes was the degree of intervention of the mother's reality in the functioning of the child's psychosocial reality.

[1] Control (CON) mode: In CON, the mother's psychosocial reality infringes upon the child's. The mother's reality assumes a power over the child's. Whether or not the mother actually succeeds in presiding over the child's reality is not the point. The essence of the empowering authority of the CON utterance has to do with the mother's **expectation** of the child's succumbing to the mother's ideas. Any utterances produced with this psychosocial topography of "presiding-over-one's-reality," can be claimed as being of CON utterances. Technically speaking, most directives or imperatives belong to this category. Examples are:

C: (putting balls on the disk).
M: *Put the yellow one first and then the blue one.*

C: (공 던지려고)
M: 하지마.

M: 이리 와.

[2] Representation (REP) mode: While the control mode, CON, utterances **thrust** a message to the child, REP utterances just present a message in front of the child, and expect the child to show spontaneous social reaction. REP utterances are intimately related to the exposition, EX, style in that they both require the same

[44] For details, see Appendix 8.

reciprocity-expected or reciprocity-ascertained attitude of the mother. If the mother is not sure of the child's communicative reciprocity, she would not just present or expose the message to the child and expect the child to show spontaneous social reaction to this message. So the employment of representation mode, REP, is indicative of the mother's assumption of the child's autonomous psychosocial reality. Declarative descriptions of ongoing, past or future events or things are the examples.

C: What about this? (putting a jigsaw piece).

M: *No.. that is not the piece..we got to find a piece for the tail.*

C: What is baby shower?

M: *The ladies will get together to prepare gifts for the aunt's baby.*

M: 여기 많이 있다.

[3] Affective (AFF) mode: This mode deals with question form utterances only, but not all questions are eligible. The questions seeking information from the child are excluded. AFF utterances deals with the mother's questions posed to express or describe the psychological, behavioral, or social aspects of the child's reality, and to redirect the **expressed** state of the child's reality to the child, implicitly suggesting to him to confirm with it. So the content being sought by the mother's question is already known to the mother, and practically speaking, the question-answer pair of turns does not affect the mother's understanding of the matter at hand.

The determination of an affective mode, AFF, utterance, however, can be a tricky task. Consider the following two cases of talk.

Case 1

C: (try to take off his shoes).

M: (a) Do you want to take them off?

Case 2

C: (try to take off the shoes).

M: (b) You want to take them off, right?

Both (a) and (b) deal with exactly the same semantic content: the child's behavior of taking off his shoes. But by definition, (a) is **not** an affective mode, AFF, utterance, but (b) is. In the case 1, the mother is asking the child his plan or desire of taking off his shoes, and the mother does not have the knowledge of the information being sought. So the child's answer to the mother's question (a) will serve to provide the mother with the knowledge that is absent in the mother's mind, and enhance the mother's understanding of the situation.

On the other hand, in the case 2, the mother tends to prescribe the child's reality, and (b) is used to redirect this prescribed reality to the child and to make him confirm. The mother does not need an answer from the child to understand the situation as one wherein the child tries to take off his shoes, because she already knows that is what the child is attempting to do. Even if it were not exactly what the child is doing, her definitional claim of the situation is already established independently of what the reality of the child is. Thus (b) is not triggered to get unknown information from the child. Rather, it is a reflection of the mother's attempt to read off the child's psychosocial reality, and make the child confirm her observational claims.

[4] Informative (INF) mode: It deals with utterances that question the child about information of which the mother has no idea. In other words, questions are raised to hear from the child about his idea, feeling, or plans. The mother sincerely intends to know what the child's ideas are. The mother does not have an idea being sought and is ready to hear what the child thinks about.

Yes-no questions, or WH-questions are the examples. But again, even when an utterance meets these formal conditions, if its prosodic or contextual clues tell that the mother is not sincere in asking the question in terms of appreciating the necessity of the answer, it is not regarded as an Informative, INF, utterance. Some of the INF utterances are:

C: (having muffins).
M: *Would you like something to drink?*

C: I don't like this.
M: *Why?*

C: 부나는 언제 와?
M: 이따 저녁 때.

Semantic contents: Cultural differences

The semantic content categories and the presentational modes were applied to each group. First of all, the levels of agreement between the raters for the scoring in analysis 3 is as follows.

Table 29
The Levels of Scoring Agreement of Analysis 3

	Korean		Canadian	
	Woojin	Gisuk	David	Charles
T.N.R.[1]	508	696	606	888
Agreement	96%	97%	98%	98%

[1] Total number of utterances reviewed.

First of all, the two groups were examined with the 4 semantic content categories. The results are:

Table 30
Percentages of the 4 Semantic Categories of Mothers' Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Child	1947	55	2601	48	6.478**
Mother	189	6	891	16	-14.223**
Child-Mother	116	3	334	6	-6.362**
World	1269	36	1633	3	5.935**
Total	3521		5459		

On the whole, the mothers' semantic focus was, in both groups, on child-related, CHI, category. The Korean mothers put more emphasis on this category, whereas the Canadian mothers managed to pay some attention to themselves as well as to the children. Notably, a significant group difference was found in the mother-related, MOT, category.

Examinations of the subareas of the Child, CHI, utterances reveals another distinctive group difference. On the whole, the Korean mothers were concerned with the behavioral aspect of each category more than the Canadian mothers, whereas the Canadian mothers exceeded the Korean mothers in their interest in the psychological aspect (see Table 31).

Table 31
Percentages of the 4 Subareas of Mothers' Child-Related Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Physical	62	3	64	2	2.033*
Behavioral	1704	88	2112	81	6.356**
Psychological	175	9	408	16	-6.987**
Social	6	0	17	1	-4.704**
Total	1947		2601		

While the behavioral aspect was the most talked about aspect of child-related, CHI, within both groups, the Korean mothers showed a significantly higher percentage of this aspect. An equally notable observation is the Canadian mothers' higher percentage of psychological CHI utterances.

More or less similar findings are observed in Mother, MOT, subcategories (see Table 32).

Table 32
Percentages of the 4 Subareas of Mothers' Mother-Related Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Physical	6	3	13	2	.95
Behavioral	168	89	654	73	4.685**
Psychological	15	8	223	25	-5.121**
Social	0	0	1	0	0
Total	189		891		

The behavioral aspect is the most popular aspect of the mother-related, MOT, utterance in both groups, but in comparison, the Korean mothers showed a higher percentage, whereas the Canadian mothers showed a consistently higher percentage in the psychological aspect.

No such distinctive group differences were found in child-and-mother related, CAM, category (see Table 33).

Table 33
Percentages of the 4 Subareas of Mothers' Child-And-Mother Related Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Physcial	1	1	2	1	0
Behavioral	115	99	326	98	.663
Psychological	0	0	4	1	-.989
Social	0	0	2	0	0
Total	116		334		

The Korean mothers' higher percentage was again observed in world, WOR, category (see Table 34).

Table 34
Percentages of the 4 Subareas of Mothers' World-Related Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Physical	983	77	1322	81	-2.644**
Behavioral	242	19	235	14	3.605**
Psychological	25	3	43	3	0
Social	19	1	33	2	-2.014*

Total	1269	1633

The major findings up to this point are:

[1] In both groups, the most concerned semantic area was the child-related, CHI, area. The Korean mothers tended to put more emphasis on this than the Canadian mothers.

[2] The Canadian mothers express more interest in themselves than the Korean mothers.

[3] While the behavioral aspect was the most focused aspect of the CHI and mother-related, MOT, categories, the Korean mothers exceeded the Canadian mothers in this popular aspect.

[4] The Canadian mothers' concern with the psychological aspect of child-related, CHI, and mother-related, MOT, categories was much stronger than the Korean mothers'.

On the other hand, examination of the presentational modes also revealed some distinctive cultural patterns. First of all, it seemed that most of the Korean mothers' child-related, CHI, utterances were presented in controlling mode, CON (see Table 35).

Table 35
Percentages of the 4 Presentational Modes of Mothers' Child-Related Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Control	865	44	952	37	4.769**
Representation	412	21	830	32	-8.238**
Affective	320	17	329	12	4.77**
Informative	350	18	490	19	-.86
Total	1947		2601		

In both groups, the majority of child-related, CHI, utterances were expressed in controlling mode, CON, implying the mothers were prone to the controlling mode when dealing with child-related utterances.[43] On the whole, the Korean mothers showed a stronger tendency to CON and affective mode, AFF, and the Canadian mothers' to the

[43] In fact, in both groups, about 93 % of the total controlling mode, CON, utterances were the child related utterances.

representational mode, REP.

On the other hand, the presentational modes of mother-related, MOT, utterances are as follows.

Table 36
Percentages of the 4 Presentational Modes of Mothers' Mother-Related Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Control	1	0	21	2	-1.768
Representation	124	66	663	74	-2.247*
Affective	39	21	59	7	6.086**
Informative	25	13	148	17	-1.362
Total	189		891		

First, it is noted that in both groups, the mother-related, MOT, utterances were most likely to be in representational mode, REP, with the higher percentage in the Canadian mothers. Significant differences were also found in affective mode, AFF, with the Korean mothers' higher percentage. What was implied was that the possibility for the mothers to present mother-related, MOT, utterances from the children's perspective was much higher in the Korean group, whereas the Canadian mothers were more likely to present mother-related, MOT, utterances in REP. A brief explanation is necessary for this Korean mothers' peculiar "vicarious perspective." Consider a hypothetical situation where a mother wants to tell the child that he/she made a mistake in cutting out the pictures from a book. If the mother presents the message in representational mode, REP, the utterance will be:

M: (a) *Oh I cut his arms..I made a mistake.*

But if the mother uses affective mode, AFF, the same message will be:

M: (b) *Oh didn't I cut his arms?...mom made a mistake, right?*

In (b), the presentation of the content is made in such a way that the message appears as if it were the child's observation. In receiving the message in (a) mode, the child knows that the message is the report of the **mother's** observation. But (b) mode has an effect of making the child come to agree with the mother's confirmation of "his/her" observation. In affective mother-related utterances, the child is **spoken for** about the mother by the mother.

The Korean mothers' tendency to speak for the children through affective mode, AFF, is also confirmed in relation to world-related, WOR, utterances (see Table 37).

Table 37
Percentages of the 4 Presentational Modes of Mothers' World-Related Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Control	1	0	13	1	-3.857**
Representation	663	52	983	60	-4.315**
Affective	275	22	176	11	8.113**
Informative	330	26	461	28	-1.2
Total	1269		1633		

In both groups, the most frequently used mode for world-related, WOR, utterances was representational mode, REP. Confirming the preceding results, the Korean mothers showed a stronger tendency to words on affective mode, AFF, and the Canadian mothers to REP.

The Canadian mothers' strong tendency to use representational mode, REP, was found in CAM utterances as well (see Table 38).

Table 38
Percentages of the 4 Presentational Modes of Mothers' Child-And-Mother Related Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Control	47	40	37	11	6.906**
Representation	16	14	232	70	-10.447**
Affective	29	25	41	12	3.328**
Informative	24	21	24	7	4.208**
Total	116		334		

The Korean mothers' orientation towards controlling mode, CON, and the Canadian mothers' representational mode, REP, are clearly demonstrated.

Not only did the two groups showed differences in the percentage of representational mode, REP, utterances in each category, they also showed differences in the categorical proportions of the total REP utterances (see Table 39).

Table 39
Categorical Percentages of Mothers' Representational Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Child	412	35	830	31	2.455*
Mother	124	11	663	24	-9.256**
Child-Mother	16	1	232	9	-9.364**
World	625	53	977	36	9.886**
Total	1177		2702		

It seems that both groups of mothers find it facilitative to express world related, WOR, utterances in representational mode, REP. The Korean mothers were particularly susceptible to this facilative effect of WOR utterances. The Canadian mothers, on the other hand, surpassed the Korean mothers in mother-related categories such as mother-related, MOT, or child-and-mother related, CAM; they were more likely to express utterances about themselves in REP, whereas the Korean mothers produced more child-related, CHI, utterances in REP.

On the whole, the Canadian mothers' percentage of REP was higher than the Korean mothers', and the Korean mothers surpassed the Canadian mothers in controlling mode, CON, and affective mode, AFF (see Table 40).

Table 40
Percentages of the 4 Presentational Modes of Mothers' Utterances

	Korean		Canadian		
	f	%	f	%	Z score
Control	916	26	1025	19	7.868**
Representation	1177	34	2702	49	-14.01**
Affective	646	18	612	11	9.331**
Informative	782	22	1120	21	1.132
Total	3521		5459		

Semantic contents: The psychosocial topography

The mother's topical categories represent her interactional focus. Considering the fact that in both groups the child-related, CHI, utterances constituted the majority of the mothers' utterances, one can say that the "watching over the child" attitude is prevalent in both groups. But that the Canadian mothers managed to spare some attention for themselves suggests that the Canadian mothers' watching-over attitude is combined with a "watch me" attitude. While in the Korean dyads only the child party is highlighted, in the Canadian group, both the mothers and the children are mentioned and referred to for their interaction.

Not only are Korean and Canadian mothers different in the categories of their interests, they also differ in the way they present their interests. The Korean children's highlighted reality is a result of the Korean mothers' insertion or submission of their own reality. As reflected in their lack of interest in the children's psychological state, the Korean mothers do not assume the children's reality is fully guarded with their own psychosocial consciousness. It is presumed to be open for the free entry of the mothers' reality, and subject to the mothers' alter-ego functionings. The mothers invite themselves to the children's reality and empower the "yet-to-fully-function" state of the children's reality. The topical focus on the children's reality emerges from such a "fusion" effort of the mothers' reality to the children's reality. In other words, the Korean mothers align themselves to the state or level of the children's reality and speak for the children. The mothers as independent individuals are no longer available. They lend themselves for the operation of the children's reality.

On the other hand, the Canadian mothers are distinguishable from their Korean counterparts in their efforts to detach themselves from the children. While the Canadian mothers, too, are liable to child-related, CHI, utterances and to controlling mode, CON, utterances, compared to the Korean mothers, their emphasis on the mother-related, MOT, category and on representational mode, REP, is much more conspicuous. The Canadian mothers' MOT-REP utterances may topically highlight the mothers themselves and promote the children's perception of the mothers as another independent individual involved in their social context. The psychosocial configuration of the Canadian mothers eventually permits their psychosocial detachment from the children. The mothers as

differentiated beings in turn may lead the children to perceive themselves as autonomous beings differentiated from the mothers.

While the Korean mothers' frequent use of the controlling mode, CON utterance represents their directing role over the children's reality, the Canadian mothers' adoption of representational mode, REP, utterances suggests they recognize the social context as being based on the spontaneous reciprocity of the mothers and the children. Instead of working within the children's reality, the Canadian mothers stay in their own reality and invite the children to come out to the shared social context. Placing the message in this socially shared area, the mothers expect the children to come out and register the mothers' messages. Such a topographical system of the Canadian mothers' communication is metaphorically isomorphic with their living arrangement, where the individual activities such as sleeping occur in everybody's own room, and family activities take place in common areas such as the living room.

If the Korean mothers' psychosocial topography is characterized by "fusion state," the Canadian mothers' is characterized by "fission state.' While the Korean mothers merge themselves with the children, the Canadian mothers withdraw themselves from the children's reality, so that the children's reality can remain autonomous. This fission strategy has the same objective as the fussion strategy: establishing a full-fledged partnership of the children. But since the Canadian mothers do recognize the independent boundary of the children's reality, within a dyadic situation, the only way to achieve the task is to draw a separate, differentiated boundary of the mothers themselves. The Korean mothers' hesitant attitude about the children's psychosocial autonomy, in contrast, makes them inject external forces, the mothers themselves, to boost the children's reality.

Summary

The culture specific psychosocial dynamics which emerged from analysis 2 were confirmed and further elaborated in their topographical anatomy.

The examination of the semantic aspects of the mothers' utterances revealed the Korean mothers' higher percentage of child-related utterances and the Canadian mothers' mother-related utterances. Notable group differences were also found in how

the messages were presented. The Korean mothers showed higher percentages in the controlling mode, and the Canadian mothers in the representational mode.

The communicative differences were interpreted as reflecting the different psychosocial topography between the mothers and the children. It was hypothesized that in an attempt to assist the children's incompetent communicative state, the Korean mothers insert their influence and result in a psychosocial fusion state in the children. The Canadian mothers opt for the psychosocial fission method and endow the children with psychosocial autonomy. The findings can be summarized in Table 41 below.

Table 41
Summary of the Results of Analysis 3

	Korean	Canadian
Semantic area focused	Child-related	Mother-related
Presentational mode	Controlling & Affective	Representational
Psychosocial topography	Fusion	Fission

D. Summary

The main objective of the present research was to determine the culture-specific psychosocial relations between the mother and the child. Since there were no previous studies that had investigated the psychosocial forces underlying communicative patterns, searches for related communicative patterns became the major task.

The search process started with the thematic progress categories in analysis 1. The results here pointed to the cultural difference in the mothers' psychosocial views of the children's reciprocity potential. Analysis 2 which examined the communicative affecting styles showed that the mothers had different psychosocial attitudes and dynamics. The final analysis focusing on the semantic aspects revealed the culture-specific psychosocial topography between the mothers and the children. The emerged culture-specific psychosocial relations and their corresponding communicative

characteristics are depicted in Table 42.

Table 42
Summary of the Overall Findings

ANALYSIS 1	Thematic Progress K: NuP C: PP	Psychosocial View K: Hesitating C: Risking
ANALYSIS 2	Affecting Styles K: DC C: EX	Psychosocial Attitude K: Insuring C: Ensured
	Communicative Pattern K: Leader-Follower C: Colleague	Psychosocial Dynamic K: Relationally-attuned C: Individually-attuned
	Partnership K: Specialized C: Equalized	
ANALYSIS 3	Semantic Content K: Child-related C: Mother-related	Psychosocial Topography K: Fusion C: Fission
	Presentational Mode K: Control, Affective C: Representational	

Both groups of mothers had one common task to accomplish in their communicative interaction with the children. This was to construct a communicative context with the psychosocially incompetent young partners. Cultural differences were found in their management of this inherent task. The Korean mothers' apprehensive view of the children's psychosocial functioning led them to constantly check, direct, or speak for the children. The result is a "specialized" communicative pattern in which the mothers were interactional leaders and the children followers. The underlying psychosocial relationship of this specialized communicative pattern is relationally-attuned to one another in a fused state.

The Canadian mothers, in contrast, trusted the children's psychosocial autonomy. Their rather risking view of the children's reality enabled them to take the children's utterance as an independent assertion of partners and not to put too much emphasis on insuring the children's reciprocity. Their communicative pattern was more or less "equalized" and the psychosocial realities remained individuated and independent of one

another. The Canadian mothers' effort ended up in a fission state of the psychosocial relation between the mothers and the children.

Given that mother-child communication is a socio-cultural system of a given society, the revealed culture-specific communicative patterns and the psychosocial relations must find their correlates in the Korean and Canadian cultures. The following section attempts to contextualize the mother-child communication in their respective cultures and demonstrate the microcosmic natures of the socio-cultural systems.

VI. CONCLUSION

A. Heuristic 1: A Psychosocial Co-construction

According to George Kelly (1955), the founding father of the "psychology of personal constructs," our "psychological business" is not to adapt to the environment or to reduce drives or needs. The primary psychological task that we perform in everyday life consists of our efforts to **make sense** out of our environment. We, as the "scientists" or "psychologists" of our own life cases, are engaged in constant interpretive processes. We construct, test, and modify our views or hypotheses about reality. The sociological interpretive paradigm (Blumer, 1966) of human behavior has also argued for this simple truism that our behavior or psychological performance is guided and directed by our incessant, purposeful enquiries about our environment.

The thesis of "business for making sense" has long been denied in the area of mother-child interaction. The mother's communicative behavior has been conceived of in terms of what it can accomplish, but not in terms of what it is. The mother, the active and purposeful enquirer of her reality, co-constituted by her child, has been reduced to a nursing dispenser or an educational tool, if not eliminated entirely. It has not been recognized that mother-child communication is an encounter between two phenomenological "self-boundaries." Moreover, the idea that mother's major task in a communicative situation with the child is to construct an interactive context with the young partner remains a foreign idea. The mother's psychosocial and procedural endeavors have degenerated into the "background."

This dissertation attempted to uncover what used to be the background by "unbracketing" the **psychosocial and procedural context** of mother-child communication. It has been demonstrated that the mother's construction process of the interpretive framework of the child's psychosocial functioning is the key factor influencing her communicative patterns. Importantly, the "**interpretive scheme at work**" is not what was predetermined at a conventional level. The interpretive scheme that the mother would use in her interaction with the child is in the process of being formulated; the mother makes constant efforts to monitor the young partner's performance and constructs a certain presumptive understanding about the child's psychosocial

functioning in the interaction. This constructive attempt of the mother is the reality of her interaction with the child.

It is imperative to note that the significance of this study lies in its development of the three communicative systems which can represent such constructive efforts of the mothers. As a first methodological instrument of its kind, the three communicative systems, Thematic Progress, Affecting Styles, and Semantic Contents, are designed to determine the psychosocial dynamics between the mother and the child. The conventional formula rested upon the notion of Mean Length of Utterance deemed to be static in nature. It is concerned with the syntactical sophistication of the individual speakers, but not with the interactional dynamics between the speakers. As a matter of fact, there has been few communicative systems or linguistic notions that capture the interactional dynamics between the psychosocial realities of the speakers. The three communicative systems developed in this study have overcome this predicament in the area and made it possible to locate and depict the interactional dynanamics of communication. Moreover, they put forth a new view that communication is a form of "topographying process" in which the individual's psychosocial realities negotiate and settle in a certain relational map.

This psychosocial thesis of mother-child communication points to a need for refurbishing our current understandings of human communication in general. It seems evident that the major problem with some current theories of human communication is their bifurcated view of speaker, interpreter and actor. The whole interactive dynamic has been insufficiently postulated. It is not within the purview of current theories that communication begins in an encounter between two or more speakers embodied in their own psychosocial realities, and that communication is patterned among the relational dynamics of the individuals' realities.

Consider the image of the speaker portrayed in speech act theory. This speaker is little more than a carrier of symbolic systems. Conversational analysis presents a similar image; that is, the speaker is reduced to an "information processor." Hymes' and Goffman's speaker is, at least, allowed to claim authorship of his/her communicative "theatrical play." But he/she remains a puppet of conventions, rituals and norms. These approaches are variations on the theme of "functional reductionism." Their collective

heuristic obscures a communicative imperative: Just as the pedagogical and nursing effects of mother's behavior replace phenomenological boundaries, the various functions that a speaker can perform camouflage the basic **task** faced by a speaker in a communicative context.

Faced with the reciprocal "self-boundary" of the partner in the communication, the speaker must recognize the presence of the other's reality and act and react according to given psychosocial realities. Social conventions come into play as "strategy structures", aiding the speaker's construction of the psychosocial context. But they are not the "tasks" that the speaker has to accomplish in order to enter into a certain form of social interaction. The basic task to be accomplished is to recognize the partner in a certain psychosocial topography. This psychosocial construction precedes specific communicative attempts. For example, before speaker A understands the performative force of B's utterance, *Could you open the door?*, A must first recognize the thrust of B's phenomenological boundary of self. Otherwise, even if he understood the performative force of the utterance, there would be no guarantee that he/she would open the door.

The psychosocial construction is not simply an individual idiosyncratic process. The ways people deal with and situate others' psychosocial realities are **socio-culturally** determined. If psychosocial process is an "etic" phenomenon observed across different cultures, how the process manifests itself is an "emic" phenomenon. This result from the present study suggests heuristic possibilities for the interpretation of cultural differences in communicative interaction. The heuristic is referred to as a "co-construction." According to this guide, the essence of cultural differences in people's communicative behavior ought to be found in how people mutually manage psychosocial processes and what psychosocial relationships result from these interactions.

B. Heuristic 2: Socialization Processes

Korea and Canada

Regardless of the mothers' cultural backgrounds, their communication with the children has one unique feature that distinguishes it from the other forms of communication: it is the heterogeneous partnership, the varying levels of the communicative competence of the participants. What is more peculiar than the existence of such an imbalanced partnership itself is the mothers' constant effort to improve this inherently impoverished state of their communication with the children. The mothers' apprehensive view of the children's ability to participate in a reciprocal exchange of speech does not allow the mothers to remain unconcerned about the children's performance. The mothers are constantly prompted to employ "surveillant measures" and guarantee the children's full participation. This "assisting responsibility" is coupled with the mothers' role as independent partner, and makes the mothers' position in communication with the children dualistic in nature. The mothers have to present themselves as both independent partners and communicative assistants.

While this duality afflicts the mothers of both cultural groups, the mothers show differences in the manner in which they manage the roles of communicative assistant and independent partner. According to the findings of the present study, the Korean mothers put more emphasis on being "assistants," whereas the Canadian mothers emphazied being "independent partners." It is important to note that these management style differences are not simple revelations of the mothers' divergent communicative styles. They basically reflect the different socialization processes that the children in different cultures undergo. The children are introduced, through these mothers' communicative management styles, to a specific conceptual framework of how to view a social context.

The Korean mothers' "assistant-management" style introduces the children to a relationally-attuned social relationship. Neither the mothers or the children are recognized as independent individuals. Their interaction distinctly remains as one between the caregivers and the care-receivers. Socialized in this pattern of a psychosocial relationship, the Korean children may come to understand the meaning of social or social context as a composition of many relationally defined selves. The concept of *social* would be understood as necessarily accompanying a certain relational

map. The meaning of social reciprocity is also defined in such a way that a fulfillment of one's relationally defined responsibility comes to represent the participant's contribution to the social transaction. If one adopts Goffman's concept of presentation of self, the Korean children can be said to learn that their social face presented in a social context must be pictured with relational properties, but not with individually defined idiosyncratic characters.

On the other hand, the Canadian mothers' "independent-partner-management" style provides the Canadian children with a view of individually-attuned social relationships. Unlike the Korean mothers, a larger portion of the Canadian mothers' social faces consists of their individual properties. Even when situated in a position of the caregiver of the children, the individual portion of their faces remains predominant. The individuated force of the Canadian mothers' face in turn leads to an individuated perspective of the children. Just as the mothers have a stabilized view of their own social faces, the children are also viewed within the mothers' stabilized perception of individuals. The children are dealt with more or less in the same way that the mothers would deal with adult partners. The children are assumed to grow with a sharper awareness of the individual properties of their social faces.

The Canadian mothers' individually attuned psychosocial relationship is not to be misinterpreted as an **individualistic**, self-interested tendency. The basic difference between the Korean mothers' relationally attuned and the Canadian mothers' individually attuned communicative patterns has more to do with the proportion of the contextual and idiosyncratic properties constituting their social faces. In the former type of relationship, the communicative context between the mother and the child is constructed on the basis of their relationally defined roles and positions. Their social faces are re-topographed according to the specific context of the relationship. In the latter, the individual properties of the mother and child take on more weight. They tend to become individuated by their idiosyncratic properties.

Seemingly, the cultural differences in the psychosocial patterns of mother-child communication are found in emic properties. The existence of the necessity of social faces is an etic concept observed in both cultures. But the specific characteristics of the social faces are different and these "content" differences lead to the distinctive

cultural patterns of people's social interaction in Korea and Canada.

Toward a socio-cultural model

The search for a new heuristic model of child socialization in the two participating cultural groups has only begun. The study has identified basic conceptual cores that could be used to characterize the communicative patterns of mother-child interaction in Korea and Canada. These patterns are now subject to a verification process. First of all, a large number of mother-child dyads from each cultural group needs to be examined. This quantitative expansion would verify that the proposed socialization patterns were not subject to sampling errors. By taking into consideration social class variables, one could also determine the extent of the cultual identity of the mothers' socialization patterns across a broad range of social classes in each cultural group.

Other attempts would be concerned with expanding the scope of the psychosocial communicative systems. Despite the researcher's effort to focus on the **interactional** dynamics behind the linguistic exchanges of utterances, the three communicative systems based on the notion of MLU are inevitably concerned with the verbally expressed dynamics. The dynamic topographings which might analyse the non-verbal channels are admittedly ignored in the present study. Given the fact that a face-to-face communicative interaction is accompanied by some topographing processes of actional, or spatial forces of the participants, a need for a communicative system that will incorporate the nonverbal exchanges as independent units of communicative interaction is compelling.

A conceptual generalization of the proposed culture-specific communicative patterns also deserves immediate attention. Various forms of other adults' communicative interactions in each cultural group need to be examined. If it proves that they can also be conceptualized by the culture-specific psychosocial patterns proposed by the present study, the findings of the present study can be elevated to the status of the two cultural groups' cultural characteristics. One would also need to assess the interrelationship between people's communicative characteristics and other microcosmic forms of a given culture, such as value, belief, language or ideological systems. It is

strongly believed that the Korean mothers' relationally attuned communicative patterns are related to Korean's cultural emphasis on hierarchical relationships and "in-group" tendencies (Lee, Cha, & Hwang, 1984; Oh, 1982); the Canadian mothers' individually attuned patterns are attributed to the Canadian cultural premises valuing the interest and goals of individual persons (Atkinson, 1982; Marchak, 1981).

With further studies concerned with these issues, the argument could be supported that mother-child communication is a microcosmic socio-cultural system that is contextually re-defined to facilitate the young members' socio-cultural development. The result will be an integrated view of child socialization processes, mother-child communication, and given socio-cultural systems.

Bibliography

Anselmi, D., Tomasello, M., & Acunzo, M. (1986). Young children's responses to neutral and specific contingent queries. Journal of Child Language, 13, 135-144.

Applegate, J.L., Burleson, B.R., Burke, J.A., Delia, J.G., & Kline, S.L. (1985). Reflection-enhancing parental communication. In I.E. Sigel (Ed.), Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences on children. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Applegate, J.L., & Sypher, H.E. (1983). A constructivist outline. In W.B. Gudykunst (Ed.), Intercultural communication theory. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Austin, J.L. (1968). How to do things with words. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bain, B. (Ed.). (1983). The sociogenesis of language and human conduct. New York: Plenum.

Bain, B. (1987). Sign, signal, symbol: A plea to social science and seminology. RSSI, 3, 267-283.

Bain, B., & Yu, A. (1982). A cross-cultural study of maternal attitudes and cognitive styles of children: Hong Kong and Canada. In R. St. Clair & W. von Raffler-Engel (Eds.), Language and cognitive styles. Lisse: Swets.

Bain, B., Yu, A., & Choi, S.H. (1989). Interethnic communication and foreign language learning: New heuristics for new Canadian realities. In M. Danesi, S. Cypwynyk-Morris, & K. McLeod (Eds.), Language and learning: Heritage language education in Canada . Toronto: Dominie.

Bain, B., Yu, A., & Choi, S.H. (1987). When the target language belongs to the teacher: Interethnic communication between Canadian (English-speaking) teachers and Korean pupils. Presented at the Third Conference on Multi-cultural and Intercultural Education: Building Canada. Emonton, Alberta.

Banigan, R.L., & Mervis, C.B. (1988). Role of adult input in young children's category evolution: II an experimental study. Journal of Child Language, 15, 493-504.

Benedek, T. (1938). Adaptation to reality in early infancy. Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 7, 200-215.

Blackman, B.I. (1983). Toward a grounded theory. In W.B. Gudykunst (Ed.), Intercultural communication theory. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Blishen, B.R., & Atkinson, T. (1982). Regional and status differences in Canadian values. Institute for Behavioral Research, Dept. of Sociology, York University, Canada.

Bloom, K. (1988). Quality of adult vocalizations affects the quality of infant vocalizations. Journal of Child Language, 15, 469-480.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). Language. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Blumer, H. (1966). Sociological implications of the thought of George Herbert Mead. American Journal of Sociology, 71, 535-548.

Boas, F. (1929). Classification of American indian languages. Language, 5, 1-7.

Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment. New York: Penguin Education.

Brown, R. (1974). A first language: The early stages. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Brown, R., & Bellugi, U. (1964). Three processes in the child's acquisition of syntax. Harvard Educational Review, 34, 133-151.

Bruner, J. (1983). Child's talk: Learning to use language. New York: W.W. Norton.

Bullowa, M. (Ed.). (1979). Before speech: The beginning of interpersonal communication. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Campos, J.J. (1984). A new perspective on emotions. Child Abuse and Neglect, 8, 147-156.

Cherry, L.J. (1979). The role of adults' requests for clarification in the language development of children. In R.D. Friedle (Ed.), New directions in discourse processing. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Choi, S.H. (1985). Social class differences in mother's speech in Korea. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Canada.

Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press.

Chun, S.Y. (Ed.). (1982). 한국의 사회 [The Korean society]. Seoul: Si-Sa-Young-Uh-Sa.

Cicourel, A.V. (1970). The acquisition of social structure: Toward a developmental sociology of language and meaning. In J.D. Douglas (Ed.), Understanding everyday life. Chicago: Aldine.

Collins, G.M., & Schaffer, H.R. (1975). Syncronization of visual attention in mother-child pairs. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 4, 315-320.

Corsaro, W.A. (1974). A developmental sociolinguistic approach to socialization.

Doctoral Dissertation, The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Corsaro, W.A. (1977). The clarification request as a feature of adult interactive styles with young children. Language in Society, 6, 183-207.

Cross, T.G. (1976). Mothers' speech and its association with rate of linguistic development in young children. In N. Waterson & C.E. Snow (Eds.), The development of communication: Social and pragmatic factors in language acquisition. New York: Wiley.

Delia, J.G., O'Keefe, B.J., & O'Keefe, D.J. (1982). The constructivist approach to communication. In F.E.X. Dance (Ed.), Human communication theory. New York: Harper & Row.

Denzin, N.K. (1970). Symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodology. In J.D. Douglas (Ed.), Understanding everyday life. Chicago: Aldine.

Erikson, E.H. (1963). Childhood and society. New York: W.W. Norton.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1977). Wait for me, Roller skate. In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell-Kernal (Eds.), Child discourse. New York: Academic Press.

Eastman, C.M. (1975). Aspects of language and culture. San Francisco: Chandler & Sharp.

Freud, S. (1940). An outline of psychoanalysis(Vol. 23). London: Hogarth.

Furrow, D., & Lewis, S. (1987). The role of the initial utterance in contingent query sequences: Its influence on responses to requests for clarification. Journal of Child Language, 14, 467-479.

Gallagher, T.M. (1981). Contingent query sequences within adult-child discourse. Journal of Child Language, 8, 51-62.

Gallant, M.J., & Kleiman, S. (1983). Symbolic interactionism vs. ethnomethodology. Symbolic Interaction, 6(1), 1-18.

Garfinkel, H. (1964). Studies of the routine grounds of everyday activities. Social Problems, 11, 225-250.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood, Cliffs.: Prentice-Hall.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Gleason, H. (1961). An introduction of descriptive linguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual. New York: Doubleday.

Goffman, E. (1981). Forms of talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Golinkoff, R.M. (Ed.). (1983). The transition from prelinguistic to linguistic communication. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Golinkoff, R.M. (1986). 'I beg your pardon?': The preverbal negotiation of failed messages. Journal of Child Language, 13, 455-476.

Goodenough, W.H. (1970). Description and comparison in cultural anthropology. Chicago: Aldine.

Goody, E.N. (Ed.). (1978). Questions and politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grice, P. (1957). Meaning. Philosophical Review, 66, 377-388.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982). Discourse strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1979). One child's protolanguage. In M. Bullowa (Ed.), Before speech: The beginning of interpersonal communication. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hancher, M. (1979). The classification of cooperative illocutionary acts. Language in Society, 8, 1-14.

Harris, Z. (1951). Structural linguistics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hayes, D.P., & Ahrens, M. (1988). Vocabulary simplification for children: A special case of 'motherese'. Journal of Child Language, 15, 395-410.

Hess, R., & Shipman, J. (1967). Cognitive elements in maternal behavior. In J.P. Hill (Ed.), Minnesota symposia on child psychology(Vol. 1). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1988). Social semiotics. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University.

Hoff-Ginsberg, E. (1985). Some contributions of mothers' speech to their children's syntactic growth. Journal of Child Language, 12, 367-385.

Howe, C. (1981). Acquiring language in a conversational context. New York: Academic.

Hui, C.H., & Triandis, H.C. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 17(2), 225-248.

Hurrelmann, K. (1988). Social structure and personality development: The individual as a processor of reality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hustler, D.(1981). Some comments on clarification requests: A response to Langford. In P. French & M. Maclure (Eds.), Adult-child conversation. London: Croomhelm.

Hymes, D. (1968). The ethnography of speaking. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.), Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

Hymes, D. (1972a). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J.J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hymes, D. (1972b). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics: Selected readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Hymes, D. (1984). Why linguistics needs the sociologist? Social Research, 51, 461-476.

Jahoda, G. (1984). Do we need a concept of culture? Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15(2), 139-151.

John-Steiner, V., & Tatter, P. (1983). An interactionist model of language development. In B.Bain (Ed.), The sociogenesis of language and human conduct. New York: Plenum.

Keenan, E.O., & Shieffelin, B. (1976). Topics as a discourse notion: A study of topic in the conversations of children and adults. In C. Li (Ed.), Subject and topic. New York: Academic Press.

Keesing, R.M. (1976). Cultural anthropology: A contemporary perspective. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Keesing, R.M., & Keesing, F.M. (1971). New perspectives in cultural anthropology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kelly, G. (1955). The psychology of personal constructs (Vol. 1 & 2). New York: Norton.

Kim, Y.Y. (1989). 한·일 민족의 유형 [The cultural archetypes of the Korean and the Japanese]. Seoul: Pyung-Min-Sa.

Klinnert, M.D., Campos, J.J., Sorce, J.F., Emde, R.N., & Svejda, M. (1983). Emotions as behavior regulators: Social referencing in infancy. In R. Plutchik & H. Kellerman (Eds.), Emotion theory: Researcher and experience. New York: Academic Press.

Kohn, M.L. (1963). Social class and parents-child relationship: An interpretation. American Journal of Sociology, 68, 471-480.

Kohn, M.L., & Schooler, C. (1983). Work and personality: An inquiry into the impact of social straitfication. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Lamb, M.E. (1981a). Developing trust and perceived effectance in infancy. In L.P. Lipsitt & C.K. Rovee-Collier (Eds.), Advances in infancy research. Nowrood, N.J.: Ablex.

Lamb, M.E. (1981b). The development of social expectations in the first year of life. In M.E. Lamb & L.R. Sherrod (Eds.), Infant social cognition: Empirical and theoretical considerations. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lambert, W.E. (1970). What are they like, these Canadians?: Social-psychological analysis. The Canadian Psychologists, 111(4), 303-333.

Lambert, W.E. (1984). Cross-cultural perspectives on child's development of an identity. Teachers College Records, 85(3), 349-363.

Lambert, W.E., Hamers, J.F., & Frasure-Smith, N. (1979). Child rearing values: A cross-national study. New York: Praeger.

Langford, D. (1981). The clarification request sequence in conversation between mothers and their children. In P. Frence & M. Maclure (Eds.), Adult-child converstaion. London: Croomhelm.

Lee, B.Y., Cha, J.H., & Whang, P.H. (1984). 한국인의 성격 [Personality of Korean]. Seoul: Jung-Shin-Moon-Hwa-Yon-Koo-So.

Lee, H.G. (1972). 공생론적 입장에서 본 부모-자녀 관계 [Symbiotic perspective of parent-child relationship.] Seoul: KIRBS

Levinson, S.C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewin, K. (1936). Principles of topological psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1967). Structural anthropology. New York: Basic Books.

Lorenz, K. (1935). Comparisons as factors in the bird's environment. In K. Lorenz, Studies in animal and human behavior(Vol. 1). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univeristy Press.

Marchak, M.P. (1981). Ideological perspectives on Canada. New York: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

McGillicuddy-de Lisi, A.V. (1982). The relationship between parents' beliefs about

development and family constellation, socio-economic status, and parents' teaching strategies. In L.M. Laosa & I.E. Sigel (Eds.), Families as learning environments for children. New York: Plenum.

McTear, M. (1979). Hey! I've got something to tell you: The initiation of conversational exchanges by preschool children. Journal of Pragmatics, 3(3), 321-333.

McTear, M. (1985). Children's conversation. New York: Basic Blackwell.

Mead, G.H. (1934). Mind, self and society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Mervis, C.B., & Mervis, C.A. (1988). Role of adult input in young children's category evolution: An observational study. Journal of Child Language, 15, 257-272.

Munroe, R.H., Munroe, R.L., & Whiting, B.B. (Eds.). (1981). Handbook of cross-cultural human development. New York: Garland STPM.

Nelson, D.K., Hirsh-Pasek, K., Jusczyk, P.W., & Cassidy, K.W. (1989). How the prosodic cues in motherese might assist language learning. Journal of Child Language, 16, 55-68.

Newport, E.L. (1976). Motherese: The speech of mothers to young children. In N.J. Castellan, D.B. Pisoni, & G.R. Potts (Eds.), Cognitive theory(Vol. 2). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Newport, E.L., Gleitman, H., & Glietman, L.R. (1979). Mother I'd rather do it myself: Some effects and non-effects of maternal speech style. In C.E. Snow & C.A. Ferguson (Eds.), Talking to children: Language input and acquisition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1982). Talking to children in Western Samoa. Language in Society, 11, 77-104.

Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language socialization across cultures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1988). Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oh, S.C. (1982). 한국인의 사회심리 [The social psychology of Korean people]. Seoul: Pak-Young-Sa.

Parsons, T. (1951). The social system. New York: The Free Press.

Perner, J., & Leekam, S.R. (1986). Belief and quantity: Three-year olds' adaptation to listener's knowledge. Journal of Child Language, 13, 305-315.

Platt, M. (1986). Social norms and lexical acquisition: A study of deictic verbs in Samoan child language. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language socialization across cultures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Radcliffe, D. (1979). The family and the socialization of children. Report of the Oct 1979 Workshop, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.

Riegel, K.F. (1976). Psychology of development and history. New York: Plenum.

Riegel, K.F. (1978). Psychology, mon amour. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rohner, R.P. (1984). Toward a conceptual culture for cross-cultural psychology. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15(2), 111-138.

Rommetveit, R. (1987). Meaning, context, and control: Convergent trends and controversial issues in current social-scientific research on human cognition and communication. Inquiry, 30, 77-99.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language, 50(4), 696-735.

Sapir, E. (1921). Language: An introduction to the study of speech. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Saussure, F. (1966). Course of general linguistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schaffer, H.R. (1977). Studies in mother-infant interaction. New York: Academic Press.

Schegloff, E. (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In G. Psathas (Ed.), Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology. New York: Irvington.

Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986). Language socialization across cultures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, W.H.O. (1973). Child development: The human, cultural, and educational context. New York: Harper & Row.

Schutz, A. (1967). The phenomenology of the social world. Evanston: Northwestern Univerisity Press.

Searle, J.R. (1970). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. London: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1980). The background of meaning. In J.R. Searle, F. Kiefer, & M. Bierwisch (Eds.), Speech act theory and pragmatics. Boston: D. Riedel.

Searle, J.R. (1983). Intentionality: An essay in the philosophy of mind. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Segall, M.H. (1984). More than we need to know about culture. But are we afraid not to ask. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15(2), 153-162.

Slama-Cazacu, T. (1983). Theoretical prerequisite for a contemporary applied linguistics. In B. Bain (Ed.), The sociogenesis of language and human conduct. New York: Plenum.

Snow, C.E. (1972). Mother's speech to children learning language. Child Development, 43, 549-565.

Snow, C., & Ferguson, C. (Eds.). (1977). Talking to children: Language input and acquisition. London: Cambridge University Press.

Speier, M. (1970). The everyday world of the child. In J.D. Douglas (Ed.), Understanding everyday life. Chicago: Aldine.

Spitz, R.A. (1965). The evolution of dialogue. In M. Schur (Ed.), Drives, affects, behavior(Vol. 2). New York: International Universities Press.

Stern, D. (1974). Mother and infant at play: The dyadic interaction involving facial, vocal and gaze behaviors. In M. Lewis & L.A. Rosenblum (Eds.), The effect of the infant on its caregiver. New York: Wiley.

Tinbergen, N. (1951). The study of instinct. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Trevarthen, C. (1979). Communication and cooperation in early infancy: A description of primary intersubjectivity. In M. Bullowa (Ed.). Before speech: The beginning of interpersonal communication. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Triandis, H.C., Leung, K., Villareal, M.J., & Clack, F.L. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. Journal of Research in Personality, 19, 395-415.

Troubetzkoy, N. (1937). Grundzuge des phonologie. Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J.V. Wertsch (Ed.), The concept of activity in soviet psychology. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.

Werner, H., & Kaplan, B. (1963). Symbol formation. New York: John Wiley.

Wertsch, J.V. (Ed.). (1985a). Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. (1985b). Vygotsky and the social formation of mind. Cambridge: Harvard Press.

White, G. (1977). Socialisation. London: Longman.

Wilcox, M.J., & Webster, E.J. (1980). Early discourse behavior: An analysis of children's responses to listener feedback. Child Development, 51, 1120-1125.

Wilson, T.P. (1970). Normative and interpretive paradigms in sociology. In J.D. Douglas (Ed.), Understanding everyday life. Chicago: Aldine.

Winnicott, D.W. (1971). Playing and reality. London: Tavistock.

Yoon, T.L. (1987). 한국인 [The Korean]. Seoul: Hyun-Am-Sa.

APPENDIX 1

University of Alberta
Edmonton
Canada T6G 2G5

Department of Educational Psychology
Faculty of Education
6-102 Education North, Telephone (403) 432-5245

August 10, 1987

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Ms. Soo-Hyang Choi

This above student is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Educational Psychology here at the University of Alberta. She is currently involved in research for her thesis requiring the videotaping of mother-child interactions in their home environments. The participation is to be voluntary with informed written consent obtained and the provision to not continue at any time be provided to subjects along with a de-briefing of the study results if participants desire. The study meets all ethical guidelines for human research and is important to further our understanding of the role of mother-child interactions with respect to child development.

Sincerely,

R. Mulcahy Ph.D.,
Professor
Dept. of Educational Psychology
University of Alberta

APPENDIX 2

연구 참가 확인서

본인 _____ 와 본인의 아동 _____ 는
최수향의 아동 밥담에 관한 연구에 아래와 같은 조건하에
참가함을 서약합니다.

1. 참가자의 집에서 15회에 걸친 30분 간의 비디오 촬영이 있습니다.
2. 비디오 자료는 자료 분석 과정을 거칩니다.
3. 비디오 자료와 참가자에 대한 토의는 모두 익명으로 처리되며
   현 연구 목적외의 다른 이유로 사용되지 않습니다.

서명 날인:

날짜:

To whom it may concern:

Re: Research Participation

This is to verify that I, , and my child, , volunteer to participate in Ms. Choi's child development research under the following conditions:

1. The research involves 15 sessions of 30 minute video-tapings in my home environment.
2. The video-materials will be subject to a data analysis.
3. Descriptive discussion of the data and the participants will remain anonymous and be referred to for research purpose only.

Sincerely yours,

Signature:

Date:

APPENDIX 3

Transcription abbreviation

IA: inaudible

L: laugh

LAC: look at child

LAM: look at mother

LP: long pause

MN: monologue

NN: nod no

NR: no response

NY: nod yes

SUR: surprise

.....: overlap

( ): non-verbal actions

(word)...(word): length of pause (one dot is equivalent approximately to one second)

/ : repeat

M 참 너는 니 주가 가느지 줬어?

W (NR)

M 응?

W 은정이 리브

M 은정이 리브? … 음 그다음에 또

W (draw)

W 엄마 e랑이 리본 다 그렸어

M 어? .. 지휴 (SHR.)

W 아니 여기 빛나는 거

M 빛나는 거 그리라며

W 됐다

M 야 잔 그렸다 .. 진짜 다랑이 같으다 .. 그치?

(to F) .. 응? (to F) .. 아유 그리고 또 아메카 리본?

W 아메카 리본?

M 응

W 아메카 리본은 ?

M 응

W (drawing)

C: (trying to touch the microphone).

M: Why don't we leave that?

C: No.

R: I still can hear you.

M: Sue can still hear you (NN).

C: Don't leave it all over (pulling toward him).

M: What if I say I don't want you to do that?

C: Hi can you hear me? (to R).

R: Yes I can.

M: What if i told you to put it down..and I don't want you to do?

C: (NR).

C: You talk first.

M: I've been talking all morning with you.

C: No in here (mic).. in that (mic)..talk..so Sue can hear you then.

M: I think Sue can hear me..cause she sitting cross from me.. actually standing acros:
from me.

C: Can you hear mommy?

R: Uhm.

M: Come on...sit there.....go back to your chair...I can't fit in that one.

C: (moved to his).

M: Will you?

C: (LP) No (move to his).

C: (talking with R).

M: This is frog Courtney speaking.

C: I'm not a frog.

M: You sounds like a frog.

C: Mama.

M: (NR).

C: Mama.

M: (LP) Yes.

C: (mouth full) Say flowers in here.

M: Well I don't wanna say flowers..I want to eat my breakfast.

C: Talk in here (point the mic).

M: I see you don't have to point to go in there...there is a type of microphone you can hear all around the room.... it's not like your microphone of your radio.

APPENDIX 4

THE TYPES OF NuP UTTERANCES

[1] Non-specific (NS): NS-CU are non-specified words such as *Yeah? Huh? Right?*, which signal to the child to repeat what he has just said. Examples are as below.

C: I went to the lake.

M: *Yeah?*

C: 나 빵 먹었어.

M: 응?

Sometimes, NS words can be used to force the child to agree with the mother, as below. This pursuasive NS is not scored as NS. A persuasive NS is as follows.

M: You like it, don't you?

C: (no response)

M: Uh?

C: (대답 없음)

M: 응? 아, 안 가?

[2] Exact repetition (ER): ER-CU repeats the child's utterance exactly. As long as all the lexical elements are present in the repetition, an addition of suffix, change of perspective, omission of the child's name, or transposition of words are overlooked. Examples are as follows.

C: I don't like it.

M: *You don't like it?*

C: 잃은 거야.
M: 잃은 거?

[3] Partial repetition (PR): PR-CU repeats any word, or phrase of the child's prior utterance. The repeated part of the utterance can be transposed; as long as the original lexical items are maintained, it is regarded as PR. The same rule applied to ER is also effected.

C: Tom didn't come to school today.
M: *He didn't ?*

C: 누나가 티 거.
M: 티 거?

[4] Complementary (CO): Mother redirects the child's utterance to him/her by adding an eclipsed word, making the child's sentence complete. A minor correction of the child's utterance as an effort to figure out the meanings of the child is permitted. But both the correction and addition should be what is contextually related and clearly implied from the context.

M: What did you do yesterday?
C: I made muffins.
M: *You made muffins* <u>yesterday</u>?

M: 언제 왔어?
C: 어제.
M: 어제 왔어?

APPENDIX 5

ORGANIZATIONAL MODES OF NuP Utterances

[1] Redundant mode (Rd): There were two basic criteria. First, the three consecutive utterances after the child's original utterance should all continue to deal with the same topic. In other words, the utterances taking the positions of (b),(c), and (d) in the following example should all be concerned with the topic in utterance (a).

C:(a) I don't like this.
M:(b) You don't like it?
C:(c) No.
M:(d) Then you don't have to eat it.

Secondly, the middle part of the exchange, that is, (b) and (c), should not contribute thematically at all to the production of the mother's second utterance, that is (d). Thirdly, the mother's second utterance (d) should be something that could have been thematically appropriate even if it comes out right after the child's original utterance, (a). Examples are:

C: 나 이거 안 먹어.
M: 안 먹어?
C: 응.
M: 그럼 먹지 마.

[2] Transition mode (Tr): First of all, in order to form a Tr, the mother's turn must entail more than 2 utterances. Secondly, the facing CU utterance in the mother's turn should be followed by an utterance which entails a real thematic response of the mother's to the child's prior utterance. In other words, the mother's thematically progressive response to the child's utterance is prefaced by CU's. Examples are as below.

M: You guys maybe go out and play.

C: No.

M: *No?*...why?

C: 나 잘 할 수 있어.

M: 응?... 그럼 잘 하지.

[3] Facilitation mode (Fa): A typical formula of Fa is as follows.

C:(a) (Utterance 1)

M:(b) (CU)

C:(c) (Utterance 1 elaborated).

There are 5 conditions to be met in order for a CU to be marked as Fa. First, the utterance in (c) position should not be simple answers such as *yeah, yes, no,* or other simple confirmatory words. Secondly, (c) should be a thematically related elaboration of (a). Thirdly, (c) can be spontaneous rather than being spurred or inspired by the mother's CU. Even then, as long as it is an elaboration of (a), it is regarded as Fa. Fourthly, the organization should not end up with being Rd. In other words, if the mother's second utterance coming after (c) renders the previously consecutive turns into Rd, the organization is recorded as Rd. Fifthly, even if (c) is not fully elaborated, as long as the child shows an indication of effort to elaborate and develop, the organization is Fa. Examples are as follows.

C: See I made a house.

M: A house?

C: Yeah and I'm going to make more windows.

C: 이것도 내 꺼.

M: 니꺼?
C: 응 저것도.

[4] Normal mode (Nr): If the child shows a confirmatory response, and this confirmation is further appropriately responded to by the mothers' answer, repetition, or query, the organization is marked as Nr. A modal formulation of Nr is as follows.

C:(a) (Utterance 1)
M:(b) (CU)
C:(c) (Confirm utterance 1)
M:(d) (Utterance relevant to (c).

If the child's utterance (c) is an elaboration of utterance (a), and the mother produces an utterance thematically relevant to this elaborated (c), in (d), the organization is regarded as Fa. In Nr, (c) should be a confirmatory or clarifying utterance that is not further thematically developed or extended. Examples are as below.

C: I want pan...(inaudible).
M: You want pan?
C: No..pancake.
M: Oh pancake.

C: 이거는 놔 두고 저거 그릴테야.
M: 이거?
C: 아니 저거, 저 밑에 있는 거.
M: 오응 그거.

[5] Aborted mode (Ab): Any other modes that do not fit into one of the above modes are all grouped as Ab. Examples are as below.

C: I don't have that.

M: You don't?

C: (no reponse).

C: 나도 가.

M: 너도?

C: (독백)

APPENDIX 6

AFFECTING STYLES

[1] Direct Contact style (DC): By using DC, the speaker asks, requests, commands, or directs the listener to be engaged in a certain activity, behavior, or communication. DC affecting style is equal to directive speech acts, which are the attempts to get the hearer to do something. Interrogation, or any forms of requests, commands, or directives, including the illocutionary acts, such as *I want you to* are the examples.

C:(punching holes on the table).
M: *Stop, C!*

M: *Put that in the sink.*

M: 언제 먹었어?

M: 이거 올려야?

[2] Exposition style (EX): The most fundamental intention of the speaker using EX is to **share** his/her observation, ideas, opinions, or descriptions of the world with the listener. Without letting the hearer know of this social intention of the speaker, the speaker speaks in expectation for the listener to listen and share with the speaker's utterance. But it is important to note that there is no explicit effort to put the listener into this responding attitude.

Most declarative utterances with some degree of descriptive intentions are EX. But the simple answer of what-is-asked-for only is not regarded as an EX utterance; there has to be more elaborate ideas spontaneously exposed by the speakers. Examples are as below.

C: (looking at something).

M: *No...these are just envelopes*

C: *Mom I want to look at all of them.*

M: *It's just the envelope..they are the same.*

C: *This is my bear.*

M: 이거는 엄마 책.

M: 곰이 저 책에 있다.

[3] Acknowledging style (AC): In AC, the mother fulfills her interactional duty as a responder by providing only what-is-asked-for by the child. And there are no more explicit intentions expressed to further continue the interaction by thematically stimulating the child. Answers to questions are most representative. But if the answers are elaborated with extra ideas of the mother, which are not asked by the child, the elaborate answers are regarded as EX. Simple acknowledgement, or any other forms of utterance that function to acknowledge the occurrence of the child's previous utterance, such as exclamative remarks are all included.

C: Mom how old is Michelle?

M: *She is three and half.*

C: (finishing drawing).

M: *That's good.*

C: 나 이거 다 그렸어.

M: 그래.

C: 이것도 오려?

M: 응.

[4] No response style (NR): NR is when there are no intended communicative acts at all. No response or non-communicative nonverbal behavior is included. Examples are as follows.

C: (drawing a picture).

M: What are you doing?

C: This is....going (to) be...(monologue)

M: I'm asking what you're doing?

C: *(no response)*

C: Mom, come over here.

M: *(no response)*

C: 엄마는?

M: (대답 없음)

C: 이거는 여기에 붙이야지.

M: (대답 없음).

APPENDIX 7

SEMANTIC CONTENTS

[1] Child area (CHI):

a. Physical CHI: ph-CHI is concerned with the physical aspects of the child's body. An example is as follows.

M: *Is your bump on your head gone?*
C: (nod yes).

M: *How is your tummy now?*

M: 우진이 키 많이 컸네.

M: 기석이는 엄마 닮았지.

b. Psychological CHI: Ps-CHI is concerned with the child's ideas, feelings, thoughts, needs, or interests.

M: *What do you think about this?*

M: *Do you want to have one more pancake?*

M: 이야기 들으니까 슬퍼?

M: 우진이 생각은 어때?

c. Behavioral CHI: Behavioral CHI refers to utterances concerning the child's

behavior.

M: *Don't punch hole on the papers.*

M: *You tying up your shoes?*

M: 그렇지 그쪽으로 오려야지.

M: 누나를 때려?

d. Social CHI: Social CHI refers to the child's social life.

M: *Is Jessica going to your kindergarten too?*

M: *Your auntie Sue will have a baby.*

M: 동규는 네 사촌이지.

M: 재석이도 다 친구야.

[2] Mother's area (MOT):

a. Physical MOT: Same as above, except it is concerned with the mother.

M: *Mommy is not tall.*

M: *I like it hot.*

M: 엄마는 키가 작으니까 그렇지.

M: 엄마 손 지금 더러워.

b. Psychological MOT:

M: *Mommy does not like that*....please don't do it again.

M: *I feel so sorry for you.*

M: 그러면 엄마가 속 상하지.

M: 엄마는 그럴 때가 제일 기쁘더라.

c. Behavioral MOT:

M: *Mommy gets her turn first...because I can do it fast.*

M: *I'll put it in this jar.*

M: 엄마가 먼저 던질께.

M: 엄마가 옮겼어.

d. Social MOT:

M: *Auntie Sue is my sister.*

M: *My dad smoke.*

M: 이모는 엄마 언니야.

M: 엄마가 큰 집에 갔었어.

[3] Child and Mother area (CAM): CAM refer to things belonging to the mother and child.

a. Physical CAM:

M: *Don't you remember our eyes were all red on that night?*

M: *You and I have blue eyes.*

M: 가석이랑 엄마랑 모두 빨갛 열었지?

M: 우진이랑 엄마는 까만 머리지

b. Psychological CAM

M: *Yeah L and I were pretty upset.*

M: *We were so glad to see grandad, weren't we?*

M: 우리 같이 생각해 보자.

M: 그때 우리 재미있었지?

c. Behavioral CAM

M: *We built this house, didn't we?*

M: *We had to move the Christmas tree down to the basement.*

M: 엄마랑 같이 잡자.

M: 엄마랑 같이 만들었지?

d. Social CAM

M: *Is auntie Sue coming to our party too?*

M: *We are all family.*

M: 삼촌도 우리 친척이야.

M: 누나도 같이 놀게 하자.

[4] World area (WOR): REP refers to any animate or inanimate objects in the environment except the mother and child.

a. Physical WOR:

M: *Ice cream makes you cold.*

M: *It is made of cheese.*

M: 나무도 '밥'을 먹어야지.

M: 이 뚜껑은 여기에 맞는 거야.

b. Psychological WOR:

M: *J was pretty upset this morning.. wasn't he?*

M: *He (dog) must be happy to see you.*

M: 누나가 화내면?

M: 아빠가 좋아하시겠지?

c. Behavioral WOR:

M: *Is Bozo (pet) playing outside?*

M: *This transformer walks so fast.*

M: 아빠가 연 만들어 주신다.

M: 누나가 다시 붙여 놨구나.

d. Social WOR:

M: *Auntie bought this crayon for you, didn't she?*

M: *Jessica is your friend, too.*

M: 기석이 생일에 친척들도 올꺼야.

M: 큰 아버지가 삼촌 형이야.

APPENDIX 8

PRESENTATIONAL MODES

[1] Control mode (CON): Any commands, directives, suggestions, or urging utterances are included.

M: *Yeah put that little head (lego) on top of that head.*

M: *Come over here.*

M: 먹어.

M: 앉아.

[2] Representational mode (REP): Any descriptive or prescriptive statements about the 4 semantic content areas are included. The grammatical mood is propositional, or declarative. REP utterances don't intend to lead to a particular action explicitly, nor do they pose a question to the child. Despite their illocutionary effects, the apparent intention is to report on the various features of the content ares.

M: *This playdoh got stuck.*

C: *See..I don't do anything...and the flower moves.*

M: 이거 여기 있구나.

M: 저 TV 위에 있다.

[3] Affective mode (AFF): The primary goal of an AFF question is not to obtain information from the child. Rather, an AFF utterance reflects the mother's effort to read the child's mind or to speak for the child for what he might feel, think, or see, and redirects the mother's observation to the child.

C: (picking nose).

M: *You want kleenex?*

C: Put on my leg (microphone)

M: Um.

C: So it can show at me...not at you.

M:(no response).

C: Just at me.

M: Uhh..what is it just at you?

C: (no response).

M: *Because you're really an important guy?*

C: (신 신으려고)

M: 신발 신으려고?

C: 이제 나 잘래.

M: 자고 싶어?

[4] Informative mode (INF): INF questions are raised to obtain information of which the speaker has no idea at all.

C: (eating pancake).

M: *Do you want one more pancake or not?*

M: *Do you want me to cut it up in your plate? (hot dog)*

M: 언제 이모, 왔다 갔니?

M: 과자 몇 개 사올려고?